APRIL 1948 PRICE 1s. 3d. NET.

The Expository Times

FOUNDED IN 1889 BY
JAMES HASTINGS, D.D.

EDITORS
A. W. HASTINGS, M.A.
Rev. E. HASTINGS, M.A.

Contents

PAGE

I. NOTES OF RECENT EXPOSITION—The Dean of Durham on the Life Everlasting—The Principle of Continuity—'An Introduction to Jesus for the Twentieth Century,' by the Reverend R. W. Stewart—A Dynamic Interpretation 169

II. UNSOLVED NEW TESTAMENT PROBLEMS: THE PROBLEM OF THE ARAMAIC ELEMENT IN THE GOSPELS. By the Reverend Matthew Black, B.D., Ph.D., D.Litt., The University of Leeds 171

III. LITERATURE 176

IV. CHURCH UNION. By Professor Emeritus A. J. Gossip, D.D., LL.D., Glasgow . . . 179

V. IN THE STUDY—
1. Virginibus Puerisque 183
2. The Christian Year 184

VI. THE EXALTATION OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. By the Reverend A. W. Argyle, M.A., B.D.(Oxon.), Gerrard's Cross, Bucks 190

VII. RECENT FOREIGN THEOLOGY. By Professor H. H. Rowley, D.D., Manchester . . 193

VIII. CONTRIBUTIONS AND COMMENTS—
1. A Note on πάσχα in the Synoptic Gospels. By the Reverend F. Bussby, M.A., The Theological College, Lichfield 194
2. The Cup Metaphor in Mark xiv. 36. By the Reverend Matthew Black, B.D., Ph.D., D.Litt., The University of Leeds 195

IX. ENTRE NOUS—Albert Schweitzer—Unsolved New Testament Problems 195

VOLUME LIX. No. 7

38 GEORGE ST. : T. & T. CLARK : EDINBURGH
EDITORIAL AND ADVERTISING OFFICES, KING'S GATE, ABERDEEN

HOLBROOK LIBRARY
PACIFIC SCHOOL

VITAL R.E.P. BOOKS

Ready Now.

Latest Senior Volume in the series of Teachers' Guides to Religious Instruction

MYSELF AND MY CREED

An outstanding new lesson book for Upper Forms on the Apostles' Creed, free of any denominational bias, the work of practical experts, and vetted by the Bishop of Bradford and Dr. R. Newton Flew. 43 lessons in 8 blocks with study notes and activity suggestions.

Cloth Boards, price 5s. net (postage 4d.)

New Edition Ready

CHRISTIANITY GOES INTO ACTION

By ERNEST H. HAYES

An outstanding volume, showing how pioneers and reformers have served mankind throughout the Christian era. 45 vivid biographies in lesson form (supplementary volume in the Teachers' Guides to Religious Instruction for Juniors and young Seniors.)

Cloth boards, price 5s. net (postage 4d.)

THE JOURNEY OF FAITH

By A. C. TOYNE, M.A. (Teacher of Religion at Hele's College, Exeter)

An introduction to the Teaching of Religion in Schools. A Divinity text-book planned on thoroughly practical lines by a Scripture Specialist, who knows the way of a right approach to this important subject.

'Every teacher of scripture should possess the book, and even those who do not follow the author all the way will find in it much that is worthy of consideration.'—*A.M.A. Journal.*

Prayers, Questions and Exercises are added. With four coloured plates.

Limp Cloth, price 6s. net (postage 3d.)

PRIMARY EDUCATION AND THE ART OF LIVING

By O. M. WYATT, N.F.U.

Presents a strong case, written out of actual experience, for the basic place of the Primary School in educational reform. Amid the prominence given to the new Secondary Schools and Further Education, there is a real danger that the foundation laid in the Infants' School may be neglected or sacrificed.

Price 2s. 6d. net (postage 2d.)

THE RELIGIOUS EDUCATION PRESS LTD.

Wallington, Surrey

★

NEW PUBLICATIONS

THE FIRST EPISTLE OF ST. PETER

By W. WILSON CASH

A new book of Bible study by the Bishop of Worcester, unfolding the essential message of the Epistle in a series of fourteen chapters. **6s.**

GOD'S PURPOSE IN REDEMPTION

The official report of the Islington Clerical Conference, 1948. Papers by H. R. Gough, M. A. C. Warren, T. C. Hammond, J. P. Hickinbotham, D. R. Davies. **2s. 6d.**

THE CHURCH: UNIVERSAL AND LOCAL

By ALAN M. STIBBS

A fresh examination of the teaching of Holy Scripture concerning the Church of God, with some application to the present day. **5s.**

THE WORD OF GOD & THE PEOPLE OF GOD

By F. W. DILLISTONE

A series of five essays dealing with the fundamental theme of the Bible and the Church, with chapters on the relation of the New Testament to the Old, the Church as the Israel of God and the Body of Christ, etc. **3s. 6d.**

TRANSUBSTANTIATION

By F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK

An important work of scholarship, being an examination of the Roman Dogma from a theological and philosophical point of view. **6s.**

CHURCH BOOK ROOM PRESS, LTD.

7 WINE OFFICE COURT, E.C.4

ANNOUNCING

'a book of high religious value . . . that challenges . . . and inspires . . .'

DEFEAT TRIUMPHANT

by

LEWIS MACLACHLAN, M.A.

Foreword by the Rev. Prof. Charles E. Raven, D.D.

PRICE 5/-

'. . . an exceptionally clear statement of the Gospel . . . its subject is essential Christianity . . .'
WILLIAM E. WILSON

'. . . it cannot fail to leave a deep impression . . .'
DR. E. L. ALLEN

Published by

THE FELLOWSHIP OF RECONCILIATION

38 Gordon Square, London, W.C.1

DEVOTIONAL CLASSICS

DR. HANDLEY C. G. MOULE

LATE BISHOP OF DURHAM

EPISTLE TO THE ROMANS 12/6

An Invaluable Standard Commentary and a True Book of Devotion. With a Running Translation interwoven with the Exposition.

EPHESIAN STUDIES . . 10/6

Lessons in Faith and Walk. A Series of Spiritual Studies through the whole Epistle, with a Running Paraphrase, verse by verse.

COLOSSIAN STUDIES . . 10/6

Lessons in Faith and Holiness. A helpful Exposition, with a Paraphrase of the Text of the Epistles to the Colossians and to Philemon, their practical teaching and principal lessons.

Postage on One or the Three Books, **6d.** extra.

'Moule was a perfect combination of a great scholar and a great saint.'—Dr. Wilbur M. Smith.

PICKERING & INGLIS LTD.

229 Bothwell Street, Glasgow, C.2

29 Ludgate Hill, London, E.C.4

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

One turns with interest to a book by Dr. Cyril Alington, Dean of Durham, on a theme which is old yet ever new—*The Everlasting Life*.[1] He disclaims any 'originality' for his book, and one may accept his disclaimer. He also apologizes for his free use of quotation, but it is just in the range and aptness of his quotations that many will find the chief interest and peculiar value of his book.

The author describes it frankly and fairly as 'a modest attempt, based on familiar passages of Scripture, to show that the life everlasting is, and must be, essentially the same as the "new life" which, as Christians, we are pledged to lead, and that that life consists, in the most literal sense of the words, in self-denial.' He adds that this view of the life everlasting is for him a new-found conviction, and he cherishes the hope that it may be so for others also; otherwise he fears that 'intelligent and literary readers' will find his iterations intolerable.

Dr. Alington analyses the causes of the present neglect of the doctrine of everlasting life, and also discusses some popular misconceptions of that doctrine—misconceptions that to a large extent account for the neglect. These gather round the ideas of the resurrection of the body, heaven, and the Day of Judgment. It is the misconception of the last-named, that of the Day of Judgment, that is the most serious, as affecting the whole atmosphere of our religious thought. In this matter people are too prone to be influenced by the hymns of the Church and the 'excessive legalism' handed down from the Middle Ages.

Dr. Alington does well to set against the popular misconceptions of the Day of Judgment that principle of continuity which affirms an intimate connexion between our life here and that which we hope to lead hereafter. The self which we carry beyond the grave must be the same self which has existed here. That is the truth behind the Romish doctrine of Purgatory, which the Anglican Articles describe as 'a fond thing vainly invented.'

If the principle of continuity be recognized as truly applicable to the relationship between the present and the future life, it is clear—as Dr. Alington goes on to say—that our capacity to appreciate the joys of the future life must, to some extent, depend on the nature of the joys we have sought on earth. In this connexion he instances William Law's satirical picture of Flavia in his 'Serious Call,' whose indifference to things of eternal value is so remorselessly exposed. The question here, however, is not so much whether Flavia and the others similarly pilloried by William Law will inherit eternal life, but whether they can hope to enjoy it.

But before the close of the book the author freely allows that the principle of continuity does not carry the whole truth regarding the life beyond. The full glory of it is more than the fulfilment of earthly life. And he cites some memorable words in which Donne seeks to picture what he dared to expect in the world to come: 'That great schoolmistress, Experience and Observation, shall be removed, no new thing to be done; and in an instant I shall know more than they all could reveal unto me. I shall know, not only as I know already, that a beehive, that an ant-hill, is the same book in *Decimo Sexto* as a kingdom is in *Folio*, that a flower that lives but a day is an abridgement of that king that lives out his threescore and ten years, but I shall know too that all these ants and bees and kings and kingdoms, however they may be examples and comparisons to one another, yet they are all as nothing, altogether nothing, less than nothing, infinitely less than nothing, to that which shall then be the subject of my knowledge, for *it is the knowledge of the glory of God*.'

Those who desiderate logical arrangement in a book, and are impatient of writers who at times

[1] Blackwell; 7s. 6d. net.

do not appear to 'stick to the point,' may not be attracted by these pages, but we appreciate their sincerity, and the breadth of sympathy they reveal, and the contribution they make to the truth of the intimate connexion between religion and life —between the Christian hope of the future and daily life in the present.

The Rev. R. W. STEWART, B.D., B.Sc., of Killermont Church, Glasgow, has published a very readable and lively book under the title, *An Introduction to Jesus for the Twentieth Century*.[1] It is of short compass—in all a hundred and twenty-five pages—but it covers much ground, and both in criticism and exposition is matterfully concerned with issues in religion and theology affecting our time.

Mr. STEWART thinks that for many people to-day the approach to Jesus along the traditional paths is difficult. The Figure of Jesus is obscured for them by what has been called 'the medieval regalia of the Creeds.' Concern for the allegiance of such people should encourage in us fresh interest in the historical Jesus, and in this interest we can avail ourselves of some helpful emphases in the modern philosophic outlook. What this means, according to the writer, is that we must seek to interpret the life of Jesus dynamically. Our estimate of Him must come by a study of His function in the movement of His time. Beyond what befell Jesus, we must probe His human life as action, as causative. The clues to Him are in what He did with all His power and will in the course of His career.

Five short but graphic chapters in Mr. STEWART'S book explore this for us. The life of Jesus is envisaged as a 'deed,' a 'career.' What Jesus does is to pierce to the deeper, fundamental levels of moral and spiritual reality. What it occasions in history is opposition and sudden doom. But even so the doom is built into Jesus' knowledge of His purpose and duty; His Passion remains Action; therein also He maintains the proportion and end of His work. This total doing of Love is the covenant of grace establishing its truth and availability; its power to bring assurance to faith and inspiration to life in the contingencies of time abides. With this very bare summary of what belongs to the expository content of the book we pass on to the interesting last chapter in which Mr. STEWART justifies what has been called the dynamical approach to the gospel history.

[1] James Clark; 6s. net.

This last chapter is entitled, 'The Newer Philosophy and the Approach to Jesus.' Is there an adequate philosophy to-day we can utilize? Perhaps not. Yet there are significant pointers in the outlook of modern thought to which we may profitably relate Christian speaking. Mr. STEWART selects three matters here, and we shall give a brief account of what he has to say regarding them and as pertaining to his field of interest.

First, modern thought distinguishes, in the content of a statement, between 'reality' and 'truth.' If we apply this distinction to Dogma then it will encourage us to insist that the essential is what has reference within experience. Too often theology has made its intellectual structure architecturally coherent but frequently futile. For example, what content of meaning belongs to a doctrine of the immutability of God in general, that is to say, apart from the experience of men of faith that God is always faithful and loving? Dogma may by its claims even prejudice historical investigation. Take for illustration the application of the term 'sacrifice' to express the meaning of the death of Jesus. As a real action of self-sacrifice for a cause it was that. But the Cross was not an altar, His death no ceremony. Yet traditional doctrine keeps hankering still after the notion that in order to get the essential clue here, we must borrow ideas from the obscurities of the Hebrew sacrificial system. But here where the Jewish cultus itself got bogged, it ill becomes a realistic Christianity to flounder. The reference to reality and history must mean here seeing the Cross as Love in action, not a symbol, but the thing itself, a willed doing.

Second, we have to-day the insistence of thought that reality is *movement* and *change*. This outlook might be utilized to get into the Biblical ideology with its concepts of the living God and of the Spirit. But from the beginning Christian thought has been powerfully under the Platonic tradition, with its categories of substance and static perfection. In consequence the formulated Creeds, though they point to Jesus, put wrappings round His figure whereby the living reality of Him is diminished if not lost. Much of the traditional Christology has made the Person a figure in drama instead of in history. We must do again what the nineteenth century tried to do—to see Jesus the Lord of the Church as He walked in Galilee on His noble errand bent; and we must do it better. In the modernly formulated creed that may arise from this Marx and Lenin will play a part as well as Plato! At this point of the dynamic unveiling to us of the career of Jesus as He enriched and

deepened and made permanently valid the vital in religion neither the Barthian Movement nor the Form Criticism School are very positive in reality despite their earnestness. They are too quickly content with the reassembly of traditional vocabulary.

The third heading is called *reality* and *chance*. 'Chance,' says Berdyaev, 'is a tremendous factor in human destiny.' But we have to admit that the idea of Jesus as the full revelation of God has often been read as if His life was a prearranged programme. Think of the 'proofs' often advanced to show that just in the year A.D. 1 and at no other time in the range of history could a Saviour of the world have been born! Generalizations of that kind are questionable. The trouble is that they encourage people to come to the record of the life of Jesus disinclined to see in Him anything but 'the official.' But His life was action; His own will was called to discern purpose, and infuse present contingency with it. His life had its dominant motives, its constancy of aim, yet we part with reality unless we see Him in the art of living, feeling His way, receiving and applying in the actuality of costing existence the light and inspiration from the fountains of Divine love. Both by His serenity of mind, and by His seizing of opportunity He is the vehicle of the revelation and redemption of God. The whole texture of Him in His on-going life among men must enter into our doctrine of His Person.

It will be seen from the synopsis here given that this little book ranges far, and is not afraid of being controversial. Philosophically regarded the 'Introduction' appears a blending of thinkers as diverse as John Oman, Berdyaev, and John Macmurray. Whether the author has succeeded in this is open for discussion, but there is nothing dull in his pursuit of it; and ever and again the glint of battle is in his eye!

Unsolved New Testament Problems.

The Problem of the Aramaic Element in the Gospels.

By the Reverend Matthew Black, B.D., Ph.D., D.Litt., The University of Leeds.

The problem of the Aramaic element in the Gospels is one of the most difficult and complicated in Biblical scholarship. Matters have not been improved in this respect, if greatly clarified in others, by the recent recognition of a fundamental error in our whole approach to it. Fresh discoveries in Palestinian Aramaic have revealed the quite unrepresentative character of the main authority hitherto recognized for the language of Jesus—Dalman's *Targum Onkelos*—and we possess neither grammar nor lexicon for some of the sources which must replace it.[1]

The position is not quite hopeless, however, provided we are prepared to do our own research (in the right places). And in spite of the complications of Gospel Semitisms and the versatility of the Koine, there is still a sufficiently distinctive Aramaic strand in the texture of the Gospel Greek to make the study of it, and of its incidence, important.

I give one illustration. Whenever we repeat the Lord's Prayer in the form 'Forgive us our debts, as we forgive our debtors,' we are perpetuating an Aramaic idiom, for it is in Aramaic, and not in Greek or Hebrew, that sin or guilt towards God or man is regularly conceived in terms of debt—Jesus meant 'trespasses,' or 'sins,' as Luke renders. In the Samaritan proverb, preserved in their Liturgy, 'Whoever receiveth *sinners* (debtors), *condoneth* their *sin* (debt),' no less than three of the five Aramaic words used are the originals of the three corresponding words in the Lord's Prayer, including that translated in Matthew as 'debts' and in Luke as 'sins'[2]: the first part of the proverb is a familiar Gospel locution, 'This man receiveth sinners . . .' (Lk 15^2). In the story of the woman who was a *sinner*, told in Lk $7^{36f.}$, the whole point of the Parable of the Two *Debtors* turns on the ambiguity of this same Aramaic word (with a probable further play on the word 'to love'[3]). Here, in both instances, we have distinctive Aramaic colouring, still perceptible in any translation of Mt 6^{12}, with the exception of the Syriac—and no one has so far suggested that the Lord's Prayer comes from Syriac.

[1] Consult P. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza* [London, 1947], 129 f. I have tried to show the relevance and importance of Professor Kahle's views for the New Testament problem in my own study, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts* [Oxford, 1946]. It is exactly fifty years ago since Dalman's *Words of Jesus* appeared; Eng. tr., Edinburgh, 1927.

[2] Cf. *An Aramaic Approach*, 102. [3] *Op. cit.*, 139.

The Lord's Prayer belongs to Q, and it is here that the most striking evidence of Aramaic origin has been found. It will be simplest to begin with that source. (Theories which claim all four Gospels, without distinction of Greek sources in any, as translations of 'lost' Aramaic originals, are curiosities of popularizing scholarship rather than serious hypotheses.)

Every student of the New Testament is indebted to Professor T. W. Manson's studies in Q with reference to the Aramaic.[1] Q is a single source and most probably represents a translation of an Aramaic document, the original order and more primitive version of which is Luke's; at a later stage the Greek version was revised with reference to the Aramaic, and it is this revised version which Matthew edited.[2] The Aramaic Q probably took shape as a catechetical manual, consisting originally of sayings only and possessing a certain literary integrity; it answers, in most respects, to the description of the 'Logia' attributed by Papias to St. Matthew and composed by him 'in a Hebrew (Aramaic) dialect.'[3]

About the Aramaic source of Q we need not be in doubt (the example from the Lord's Prayer is convincing enough proof), and it is doubtful if a better theory of the origin of Q can be given, without producing fresh evidence. Perhaps in one direction, however, Dr. Manson's view may be developed, along lines suggested by a study of Wilhelm Bussmann's *Synoptische Studien*.[4]

Bussmann was impressed (as all students of Q must be) by the differences within the source. In about half of the passages usually assigned to it, verbal agreement between Matthew and Luke is striking; in the other half, community of subject matter rather than identity of language justifies our assigning them to the 'double tradition.' Various explanations, by no means mutually exclusive, have been given of this perplexing fact.[5] Bussmann, by analysing out stylistic and other differences between the first group of passages and the second, concluded that Q^A (to simplify his *sigla*) represented a distinct source which had come into the Evangelists' hands as an already translated Greek document; in Q^B, Matthew and Luke were themselves independently translating a different Aramaic collection, 'each as he was able'; Q^A contains narrative, Q^B 'logia' or sayings only, and it alone is to be identified with the Logia of Papias.

It is in this second part of the theory that the appeal is made to Aramaic. So far as the 'two-source hypothesis' is concerned, it is extremely doubtful if Bussmann has made out his case.[6] The further 'bifurcation' of Q^B into two independent translations is supported by no less than one hundred and twenty-two alleged 'translation-variants.' The list contains evidence of Aramaic origin: that fact is not in doubt; it is similar to the evidence in Q^A and contains some of the most striking examples.[7] But *less than one-third* of the 'variants' only can be so explained, and even there, there must always be some doubt. 'Variants' are mostly Greek synonyms, and when we compare them, it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that Matthew's Q is simply a Greek revision—he is doing for Q what he does for Mark. Luke is the more primitive Greek version.

But still more significant literary processes have been at work in producing Matthew's edition of Q. In more than half of Bussmann's 'variants,' while the meaning is much the same in both Gospels, Matthew's 'version' resembles nothing so much as a free literary paraphrase; a comparison, for example, *inter alia*, of the two forms of the Beatitudes (or of the Lord's Prayer, with its added liturgical ascription) suggests that Matthew is doing some Greek 'targumising' of Q on his own. Nothing certainly could be clearer, when Bussmann's parallels are compared one by one, than that Q in Matthew is not just a translation: *it is a Greek literary composition.* And it is not improbable, in view of Matthew's known editorial methods, that Streeter is right in thinking that he has also collated 'parallel versions' of sayings which he found in his special source with Q sayings.[8] No other hypothesis can so satisfactorily account for the wide divergence in language in the B passages.

This is to say nothing new: all these possibilities are allowed for in Dr. Manson's view of a revision of Q edited by Matthew.[9] But what of Luke? To what extent, if any, has the Greek literary process which we can detect in Matthew affected Luke's version of Q?

[1] *The Teaching of Jesus* [1931], 27 f.; *The Mission and Message of Jesus*, 331 f.

[2] Cf. THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, XLVII. i. 7 f.

[3] See especially, *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, xxix. 2, 4 f., and 17.

[4] Halle, 1925. The stimulus to undertake this inquiry came largely from Principal Vincent Taylor, of Headingley College, Leeds.

[5] See Vincent Taylor, in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, XLVI. ii. 70 f.

[6] Cf. Taylor, *op. cit.*, 73 f.

[7] Bussmann, *op. cit.*, ii. 151 f.; cf. Manson, in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, *loc. cit.*

[8] *The Four Gospels*, 238 f.

[9] It is difficult to maintain the distinction between an earlier revise of Q and Matthew's 'revise' of this revision. What is clear is that a great deal of the revision comes from the hand of the author of the Gospel.

It seems to me to be reasonably certain that over large tracts of Q[A] we have to do with a translated tradition, in the main a faithful rendering of an Aramaic source; the parallelism of lines and clauses, which Eduard Norden considered the most certain 'Semitism' in the New Testament,[1] is an indication that the literary structure of the original is behind the version.[2] Moreover, in one instructive example of a saying in Q which is preserved *in a different translation* in Mark, we can see at a glance that both versions are based on a single definitive Aramaic text, and are entirely faithful to it: Lk 17[33] (=Mt 10[39]) is parallel to Mk 8[35]; θέλῃ and ζητήσῃ translate the same Aramaic verb;[3] σώζειν, περιποιήσασθαι, and ζωογονήσει are all translation-variants[4]—here, if anywhere in the Gospels, is an example of 'each translating as he was able.' Other similar examples I have noted elsewhere.[5] The translations are literal ones: it is when we consult the parallels in Matthew and John (12[25]) that it is impossible to speak (as Bussmann does for Matthew) of 'translation-variants'; both are literary 'targumisings' of the saying, using such familiar contrasts as 'seek' and 'find,' 'love' and 'hate.'[6]

But there are other passages where we can detect a literary re-writing of a saying in the Lucan Q. I have noted elsewhere that it is only in Mark that we find anything resembling a literal translation of the parables (even there the 'translation' is, in many respects, more literary than literal).[7] If we compare the overlapping tradition of Mark and Q in the Parable of the Mustard Seed (Mk 4[30f.]=Lk 13[18f.]: Mt 13[23f.] is a conflation of Mark and Q), Q=Luke is faithful in all but language to the Aramaic behind Mark.[8] In the Beelzebub controversy (Lk 11[17f.]=Mk 3[23f.]), the underlying structure of the Marcan parallelism depends on the four times repeated (and rhetorically most effective) δύναται (*v.*[25] δυνήσεται, the same Aramaic); the structure has dissolved in Luke in a literary re-writing (with conspicuous hypotactic participles in marked contrast to the Marcan parataxis). The most instructive example, however, is Q=Lk 12[10], where the sin against the Holy Ghost is contrasted with a word against the Son of Man; Mark has nothing about the Son of Man, but he has the Aramaism 'sons of men' for men: the question of priority may be here debatable, but there can be no question in the rest of the saying where the Judaistic outlook of Mk 3[29] is replaced by an abridged version in Q, deliberately soft-pedalling the harsh sentiment retained in Mark.[9] (Matthew is faithfully 'targumising' Mark as well as conflating with Q.)

This evidence of 'non-translation Greek' in Q is just as important as the evidence of translation; and it points to something more than minor editorial improvements by Luke. In the light of it, it is doubtful if we are justified in describing Q, without qualification, as a translation of Aramaic. Certainly it seems clear that the most the Aramaic element can *prove* is an Aramaic origin, not always translation of an Aramaic original; and *it is the Greek literary factor which has had the final word with the shaping of the Q tradition.*

The evidence from the Gospels themselves for the existence of an Aramaic document is necessarily speculative. But if a collection of Aramaic Logia did exist, as Papias claims, there is as much probably to be said for the theory that more than one cycle of the Greek sayings-tradition is indebted to it, especially in view of such overlapping 'logia' as we find in M and Q, and Mark and Q, as for its identification with a single collection such as Q; the latter theory has always to reckon with the narrative element in Q[A]. Whether more has actually been made of the Papias tradition than it is worth is difficult to say; it is doubtful if it could have arisen, as Bacon has suggested, by a confusion of the original 'Hebrew' with the later Aramaic 'targums' of Matthew, which circulated among Jewish Christians in the second century.[10]

[1] *Agnostos Theos*, 365.
[2] Cf. *An Aramaic Approach*, 106 f.
[3] *Op. cit.*, 178.
[4] Of Aramaic *haya*: in LXX Ezk 13[18], περιποιεῖσθαι τὰς ψυχας becomes in Symmachus περισώζειν (Theodotion has ζωῶσαι); Origen on Ex 22[18(17)] reports the variant ζωογονεῖν for περιποιεῖν—all go back to Hebrew *haya*. Consult Field's *Hexapla, in locis*.
[5] In THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, LIX. i. 14 f.
[6] The alternative (and it is a serious one) is to assume that Matthew and John have independent sayings from the same discourse. But they cannot be *traced* to translation of Aramaic.
[7] *An Aramaic Approach*, 45.
[8] To assume, as I have done (*op. cit.*, 123), an original *zera'* behind σπείρειν and *ze'er* as the original of μικρότερον is no more 'conjectural' than to translate in English by 'sow' and 'less'; these are the inevitable equivalents of common words. *No paronomasia is more certain in the Gospels.* But all this can be recovered from Mark only—it disappears entirely in Luke's literary ὃν λαβὼν ἄνθρωπος ἔβαλεν εἰς κῆπον ἑαυτοῦ. But Q is in touch with the Aramaic where Mark is not in ηὔξησε (*ib.*).
[9] Where ἁμάρτημα in its first occurrence is *hobha* '*sin*,' and in the second, the consequence of the final Sin, is really=κατάκριμα (T.R. κρίσεως!). It is the same word which is used in Aramaic for ἔνοχος: ἔνοχός (*hayyabh*) ἐστιν αἰωνίου ἁμαρτήματος (*hiyyubha*), *obnoxius est condemnationis aeternae*. Cf. *An Aramaic Approach*, 102. Mark is the all too literal translation, which disappears in Luke.
[10] Cf. G. D. Kilpatrick, *Origins of the Gospel according to St. Matthew* [Oxford, 1946], 5.

Next to Q, the most likely place in the Gospels where Aramaic sources have been used is St. Mark. Mark's Old Testament, if it was not an Aramaic Targum, must certainly have owed something to the Palestinian synagogue.[1] That he had access to an Aramaic sayings-collection (cf. the examples above), perhaps already in a Greek form, is as certain as the Aramaic origin of Q: the parables in ch. 4 and the sayings in ch. 9 are probably culled from some larger collection, quite possibly from oral or written Aramaic 'logia' (the 'Hebrew' Matthew?).[2]

The Marcan narrative is the most Semitic in the Gospels, and in some cases has a monopoly of narrative Aramaisms.[3] Such evidence may point to the employment of narrative sources; and it is very probable that early stories about Jesus,[4] and in particular the Passion Narrative, first circulated in Aramaic, no doubt in conjunction with sayings.

According to Papias, Mark was the interpreter of Peter; and it is striking to note the similarity between the general shape of the Gospel and Peter's *catechesis* in the household of Cornelius (Ac 13).[5] More recently, a serious attempt has been made to establish, by internal evidence, a connexion with Peter, and to distinguish a Petrine source in Mark. In his *Marcan Usage*, C. H. Turner drew attention to a curious recurring 'impersonal plural' in the Gospel, where the reference appears invariably to be to the Twelve.[6] The Marcan mannerism loses its awkwardness if we turn these third plurals into first plurals, and Turner (following Godet) was convinced that we have here the original memoirs of the Apostle, put into the third person by the Evangelist. The passages with the 'Turner mark' have been isolated and studied by T. W. Manson in a recent lecture.[7]

The one serious objection to the theory is that impersonal plurals, where the subject has been once mentioned or is too well known to require special mention again, is a recognized feature of all simple Semitic narrative.[8] It is doubtful if any conclusions as to source can be based on this attractive theory. But the 'mannerism,' if it is not to be so explained, may be taken as additional evidence for Mark's Semitic style.

In the other parts of the Synoptics, a stronger case can be made out for Semitic sources in narrative and non-dominical *oratio* in Luke than in Matthew. The Birth and Infancy stories in the First Gospel are almost certainly the literary work of the Greek author. The pun in Hebrew in 1^{21} has been taken to indicate a Hebrew original: no doubt the word-play did exist first in Hebrew among Jewish converts,[9] but it by no means follows that the Birth stories in which it is found were all alike originally Hebrew and translated by Matthew into Greek. Matthew is probably taking over, in Greek, traditional Jewish-Christian material. Other indications in these early chapters have been found of his dependence on previous tradition, but their stylistic integrity, and the absence of familiar literary source phenomena, make it unlikely that the tradition had assumed a literary form before Matthew wrote or was incorporated by him in his Gospel from documentary sources.[10] Elsewhere, except where he is drawing on sources for his sayings, Matthew's Greek shows gifts both of style and composition.[11]

With the Birth and Infancy stories in Luke we are on less certain ground. The choice appears to lie between a theory of Hebrew or Aramaic sources translated or found in Greek translations by Luke, or of simple Lucan composition in Semitic Greek, owing much, if not everything, to the LXX. That Luke can write an excellent 'pastiche of Septuagintal Greek,'[12] and the obvious indebtedness of the Lucan hymns to the LXX, appear to favour the second hypothesis. On the other hand, it is difficult to believe that a Greek writer, who can compose the rhythmic Attic prose of the Preface and the idiomatic and quite un-Semitic Hellenistic Greek of the second half of Acts, should adopt the 'Biblical Greek' *pasticcio* in certain parts of his two-volume work, except for reasons such as the source-hypothesis supplies; and there is no doubt that Luke is dependent on sources (and the language of the LXX) in his peculiar sayings material.[13] It does not seem to me that the two views of the early

[1] Cf. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus*, 77.

[2] A mnemonic connexion in Aramaic can be established between the sayings in Mk 9; cf. *An Aramaic Approach*, 127 f., 142.

[3] *Op. cit.*, 70 f.

[4] The first account of the Feeding of the Multitude is more Semitic than the second, which looks like a Greek literary version. See W. Knox, *Hellenistic Element in Primitive Christianity* [London, 1944], 4 f.

[5] Cf. B. F. Westcott, *An Introduction to the Study of the Gospels*, 175 f.

[6] *J.T.S.*, xxvi. 225 f.

[7] *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, xxviii. 1.

[8] Cf. *An Aramaic Approach*, 92.

[9] Ro 13^{8} yields a pun in Aramaic, 'Owe (*hobh*) no man anything, but to love (a form of *hab*) one another'; cf. A. Meyer, *Jesu Muttersprache* [Leipzig, 1896], 125.

[10] Cf. G. D. Kilpatrick, *op. cit.*, 54 f.

[11] Kilpatrick, *op. cit.*, 139. A faultily translated saying from M, parallel to a Q saying, is discussed by me in *An Aramaic Approach*, 148 f.

[12] Cf. C. H. Dodd, in *Journal of Roman Studies*, xxxvii. [1947], 47–54.

[13] Cf. *supra*, on Lk $7^{63f.}$. The sayings of Jesus here are inseparable from the story; the latter, no less than the former, probably derives from a source-tradition in Aramaic.

chapters are necessarily incompatible; the LXX (or its equivalent) may have been the only 'aid' the Greek translator-author(s) had for their work.

Moreover, in the poetic *haggada* of the old Palestinian Targum, which in one place can be definitely dated to pre-Christian times,[1] Messianic poems, including one 'hymn' of expectation, composed in a literary Aramaic, present parallels to the Lucan hymns.[2]

The hypothesis of sources behind St. John's Gospel is now being seriously discussed by scholars who make little if any appeal to Aramaic. In his *Ego Eimi*, published in 1939,[3] Eduard Schweizer reached the conclusion (described as a well-grounded working hypothesis only, not a definitive result) that the Fourth Gospel was not an entirely free creation, but written on the basis of a tradition, which had already assumed a written form; it is also conceivable that the Evangelist made use of two distinct sources, a narrative and a sayings collection. The Gospel as a whole, however, bears the impress of the mind and style of a single author, and this makes it difficult to analyse out any earlier sources.[4]

These tentative and cautious statements have been endorsed in language less guarded, and from a more authoritative quarter, in the new commentary on the Fourth Gospel by Rudolf Bultmann, which appeared during the War.[5] Bultmann distinguishes a *Redeuquelle* (RQ) from a narrative *Semeiaquelle* (SQ, a collection of miracle stories), and 'the original language of RQ was either Aramaic or Syriac, as is shown by occasional obscurities best explained by defective rendition into the Greek.'[6]

This last result is striking confirmation of conclusions which have been arrived at by scholars interested in the Aramaic background of the Gospel. Few have been prepared to accept C. F. Burney's theory of an Aramaic origin for the whole of John, but a recent examination of the distribution of Burney's Aramaic element by T. W. Manson leads to a result which runs parallel to the Bultmann-Schweizer analysis: a narrative source, with points of contact with the Synoptics and where distinctive Aramaic colouring is absent, can be distinguished from a sayings source characterized by an Aramaising style and other source phenomena.[7]

If Bultmann is right in his analysis, the *Redeuquelle* (a Johannine Q!) covers a large area of the discourse material (the passages in question are detailed by Easton). It is preceded by a group of sayings of the Baptist as in the Synoptic Q, where there is the same evidence of source. The difficulty will probably be (as with the other Q) the delimitation of the source, and it is complicated by the unity of the Johannine style and the absence of a 'double tradition.'[8] But it is a significant result to be able to speak at all about a Johannine Q.

It was Streeter who coined the phrase 'interpretative transformations' to describe the Johannine discourses. An inspired 'targumising' of an Aramaic sayings tradition, early committed to a Greek form, is the most likely explanation of the Johannine speeches, but, in that case, it is no different in character from the literary process which gave us the Synoptic *verba Christi*. For the extent of this process of 'transformation' we must wait the results of further study, but in the light of recent work it would appear to be becoming a gradually diminishing area: the rabbinical character of the discourses and their predominantly poetic form certainly do not discourage the belief that much more of the *verba ipsissima* of Jesus may have been preserved in the Fourth Gospel—with John the Apostle as inspired 'author'—than we have dared believe possible for many years.

. . . . . .

It is not a new thing for some of the most important results of an investigation to prove to be its by-products and not only the achievements of its professed aims. Possibly one of the most important 'discoveries' in the search for Aramaic sources behind the Gospels has been the late Professor A. J. Wensinck's restatement, in the light of fresh evidence, of Wellhausen's view of Codex Bezae and its Semitisms; the latter come directly out of the Aramaic *milieu*, historical and literary, Palestinian or Antiochene, in which the Gospels and their sources took their origin; they are not to be dismissed as late importations from

[1] *The Cairo Geniza*, 122 f.

[2] I hope to publish a study of the poetic *haggada* of the Palestinian Targum. For a point of contact with the Birth stories in Luke, cf. J. M. Creed, *The Gospel according to St. Luke*, 31.

[3] *Ego Eimi . . . ein Beitrag zur Quellenfrage des vierten Evangeliums* [Göttingen].

[4] *Op. cit.*, 107, 108.

[5] *Das Evangelium des Johannes* [Göttingen, 1941], pp. 12*, 567. I have tried without success to obtain a copy of this important work. The information I have about it comes from Professor Paul Kahle, who drew my attention to a long and competent review article in *The Journal of Biblical Literature*, lxv. [March 1946], 73–81, by B. S. Easton.

[6] Easton, *op. cit.*, 80.

[7] *Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, xxx. 2, 13 f.

[8] The Egerton Papyrus may supply us with material for comparison, however fragmentary; cf. Bell and Skeat, *Fragments of an Unknown Gospel*, 361, and *Revue Biblique* [July, 1947], 442.

Syriac versions.[1] This account of the so-called 'Western' text, the importance of which for 'our great textual question' was acknowledged by J. H. Moulton, rests on evidence which it is no longer possible to ignore. If the view is accepted, it will help to bring back the textual criticism of the Gospels and Acts to the main line of its development, after more than fifty years of the Westcott and Hort theory. And signs are not lacking elsewhere of the urgent need for a reconsideration of textual theory. Simple faith in a 'Graeca veritas' is no longer possible or desirable. The question is of more than academic interest; any new translation of the New Testament will require to deal first with the technical problem of text.

[1] In *The Bulletin of the Bezan Club*, xii. [Leyden, 1937].

Literature.

DOCTOR JOHNSON'S PRAYERS.

The Student Christian Movement Press has done well to re-issue *Doctor Johnson's Prayers* (6s. net) in a chaste and worthy little volume, and with a competent and commendable introduction by the editor, Mr. Elton Trueblood.

The book is, indeed, only a maimed thing beside the original 'Prayers and Meditations.' So much in that last which grips at the heart is here omitted —the cruelly honest self-examinations; the vows and resolutions again and again reiterated; and, later, the abashed confessions that, too often, not much has come of them: the dogged 'ever new beginnings' in which one of the greatest of them assures us that 'the perseverance of the saints consists,' with which Johnson, beaten but unconquered, sets himself against the faults that domineer it over him, and turns to God as his one hope—all that, which falls aptly under the original title 'Prayers and Meditations' (so at least in the third edition, 1796, and not, as Mr. Trueblood has it 'Devotions'), is not here. Yet enough is given to prove to a new generation how genuine a religious classic, as the editor says truly, these devotions are.

For Johnson was a man really devout. His religion was the centre of his being. And he needed it. For, in spite of the valour so characteristic of him, life was to him a grim and perilous adventure, and man by himself quite unable to see it through with honour. Moreover, lively companion though he often was, and interested in a hundred things, there was that desperate melancholy always brooding in the secret places of his mind. He was not as assured of certain things that help as many others are. Of immortality he would have liked more evidence, and clearer. The holiness of God awed him, and made him feel unclean. The Judgment Seat was a tremendous unforgettable fact, the prospect of which shook him. And cheap words and a chirpy optimism helped him not at all. Once he declared to Dr. Adams, 'I am afraid I may be one of those who may be damned.' And when the other asked, 'What do you mean by damned?' replied, 'passionately and loudly,' 'Sent to hell, Sir, and punished everlastingly.' And, on Mrs. Adams saying, 'You seem, Sir, to forget the merits of our Redeemer,' 'Madam, I do not forget the merits of my Redeemer: but my Redeemer has said that he will set some on the right hand, and some on the left.' 'He was in gloomy agitation,' adds Boswell.

Hence Johnson's prayers are real prayers, the crying of a soul to God that needs Him, and must have communion with Him. His gift in devotion seems to have been known, or suspected, in his lifetime. Witness that occasion when they crowded round him, imploring him to set himself to the making of a book of prayers, a suggestion from which he shrank back in something like terror, covering his face with his hands, 'Do not talk,' he said, 'of what is so awful.' Yet on his twenty-ninth birthday he had begun a habit of setting down with care what he felt that he should say to God, and of revising that and adding to it, more or less constantly, throughout the years.

Deissmann declared that he could not bear any written prayers, asserting that they are not true prayers, but rather literary exercises; and that he could hear the clicking of the machine into which these craftsmen had dictated them. Well, there are prayers that seem to fall under that condemnation—R. L. Stevenson's, for instance, very markedly. Of these last, two are noble, yet lack the authentic note; and some are unbelievably bad; and all of them smell of the lamp, and have an unpleasant air of satisfaction at the apt turning of the phrases. But Johnson was far too much in dead earnest for that. His prayers are religious, simple, sincere; and, because of that, written in the clean, nervous, masterly English, he always had at his command, when he cared to lay aside his other monstrously polysyllabic style.

Johnson was much aided by anniversaries. Hence many of his prayers are for his birthday, or a new year, or a remembrance of his wife's death, or the beginning of a fresh enterprise, such as on starting The Rambler; or for Good Friday, or for that day of days for Johnson, Easter. Yet, curiously, his prayers written for that last have little exultation in them over the Master's triumph, still carrying on much of the Passion note.

One thing has always struck me about Johnson's prayers. Notably they are practical and level with life, and yet——. With all his great qualities Johnson, upon occasion and with certain people, was an unmitigated bully in talk, brutal almost beyond credence, and colossally rude. His form of sport was discussion; and he could not bear to be beaten in it, but roared folk down; and, as Goldsmith ruefully put it, 'There is no arguing with Johnson: for if his pistol misses fire, he

knocks you down with the butt-end of it.' This, it is true, only to some. A Mr. Mickle, for example, tells us that, though he had been much with him for twelve years, 'he had never had a rough word from him.' Yet the thing was known and self-evident, and a distress to his friends. When, for example, Johnson, when ill, asked Langton to warn him of what he saw amiss in his life, that good soul laid his hand on this. Whereupon, though Johnson had once declared, 'I know not who will go to heaven if Langton does not,' he turned in fury on his friend, so that Sir Joshua Reynolds called it 'a scene for a comedy to see a penitent get into a violent passion and belabour his confessor.' Apparently Johnson, who once remarked complacently that he counted himself a good-natured man, as in very deed he was everywhere but in talk, did not recognize his fault, or else would not admit it was a fault. And, certainly, although so earnest to amend himself, there is no mention of this weakness in his prayers and no crying to God for help against it. A striking and a daunting fact! For, probably, we are all as blind about ourselves, and our prayers as woefully off the target of our most desperate needs. Such cause have we to say with that wise man of long ago, 'Search me, O God, and know my heart: try me, and know my thoughts: and see if there be any wicked way in me, and lead me in the way everlasting.' A. J. Gossip.

A PHILOSOPHY OF RELIGION.

That the distinguished Professor of Philosophy in Boston University, Edgar Sheffield Brightman, should give to the world *A Philosophy of Religion* (Skeffington; 18s. net) is just what those who know his previous publications may regard as not only appropriate but eminently desirable. He is now fully matured in judgment and can show an easy mastery of all the most important contributions to the subject that have been made since first Philosophy of Religion emerged to independence. The amount of reading that has gone positively or negatively to form Professor Brightman's views is colossal, as a glance at the bibliography will reveal. Nor is it a case of a writer simply drawing up a list of books on the subject. The Index of names actually cited in the course of the book proves that.

It is a work which for literary style makes very pleasant reading. *Bons mots* are not infrequent; as when he says that only God, or one who thought he was God, could purpose to give *the* philosophy of religion. He is careful, that is, to avoid dogmatic pronouncements. He has his own views strongly enough held, but is careful to remind us that, after all, they are just his own views.

One great value of the work lies in this—that the writer gives us so many views and discusses them—gives them with fairness and discusses them so dispassionately. His treatment of such topics as the Finite God or the immortality of the soul, are from this point of view, good examples, but such is the method all through.

To attempt even to catalogue all the topics here dealt with in so illuminating a fashion would be futile, space considerations being what they are. Suffice to say that here we have a work which one may well wish could be in the hands of every teacher and every student of philosophy of religion. There is doubtless room here and there for differences of opinion from the writer. But it is safe to say that there will be no ignorance left as to what main opinions have been actually held. And, after all, must we not all work out our own philosophy of religion as we work out our own religion in life? For, as the author reminds us more than once, religious experience, of which philosophy of religion is the coherent account, is part of our total experience.

W. D. Niven.

REVELATION AND RESPONSE IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

The Bishop Paddock Lectures delivered in 1946 at the General Theological Seminary, New York, by Professor Cuthbert A. Simpson, have been published under the attractive title, *Revelation and Response in the Old Testament* (Cumberlege; 14s. net). They cover the period from the beginnings of Yahwism to the Exile. In them the author has 'tried to trace the development of the religion of Israel from its beginnings, and to show how the Divine revelation to which this development was the response was mediated through historical event.' Unlike most contemporary American writers on the Old Testament, Professor Simpson shows little interest in the archæological approach to historical problems, but views the history purely from the standpoint of the sources hypothesis (literary criticism). His general thesis is unexceptionable, but it must be said that his interpretation of the historical materials is highly speculative. Israelite Yahwism was pre-Mosaic, and was born of response to volcanic and storm phenomena. (Does this not mean that it was originally a nature religion rather than a religion based upon 'historical event'; and, if so, is not Professor Simpson cutting the ground from under his own feet?) The sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt was only short, and largely a matter of chance; possibly only a single clan was concerned in it, and the oppressor of the Hebrews was not the great Pharaoh himself, but only a local petty tyrant. Moses was never in Egypt at all, though it was he who, when he heard of it, gave to the event at the Red Sea 'enduring significance' and 'elicited from Israel a creative response.' Professor Simpson's handling of his materials is similar to Eduard Meyer's *Die Israeliten und ihre Nachbarstämme* (1906), to which he frequently refers. By all means let the early Old Testament materials be submitted to this kind of criticism and analysis. It is interesting, if not always convincing. But it hardly provides the basis for a philosophy of revelation. C. R. North.

A second revised edition of *The Early History of the Liturgy*, by Canon J. H. Srawley, D.D., has

been issued by the Cambridge University Press (10s. 6d. net). The first edition appeared in 1913. The work is a masterly, comprehensive, and matter of fact survey of the fragmentary, haphazard and varied evidence that has been preserved regarding the liturgical practices of the first four centuries. It shows the enormous field to be covered by a student of early liturgy and it leaves the impression that there is no prospect of finding in these records any basis of exact authority for the forms and doctrines which crystallised later on.

Accounts or reconstructions of rites in various localities throw interesting light on the life of the Church there at that date, but it is vain to try to trace a general development of thought or cultus towards an ideal universal or normal shape, or to see, in a local experiment which might be widely imitated, the inevitable unfolding of what was latent in the germ of the Divine institution.

This is a book to be commended, especially to students who have been impressed by Dix's massive volume on 'The Shape of the Liturgy.' It is a drier book but shorter and unbiased.

The First Epistle of St. Peter (Church Book Room; 6s. net), by the Right Rev. W. Wilson Cash, D.S.O., O.B.E., D.D., Bishop of Worcester, is an introduction to and exposition of 'one of the most inspiring of the Apostolic Letters in the New Testament.' The book is written on popular lines, and it is not a Commentary in the usual sense, though the outline plan is adapted from Dr. Selwyn's Commentary. The author's aim is to stimulate his readers in their devotional study of the Bible, and throughout the book that aim is consistently and effectively maintained.

The Rev. Lewis Maclachlan, M.A., editor of 'Reconciliation,' an organ of Christian Pacifism, gives a certain expression to his Christian convictions in the latest publication of the 'Fellowship of Reconciliation'—*Defeat Triumphant* (5s. net). In the Foreword Dr. Charles E. Raven summarizes the teaching of the book in the following terms: 'God is God, and God is love: this is what Jesus disclosed and enacted. To be a Christian is to live as if this was true: this is what Jesus did and does. Because God is God, this way is in fact triumphant—the only true means for the overcoming of evil. Because God is love, this way involves defencelessness and a Cross—and therefore Easter and Pentecost.' Obviously it is only in the use of the word 'defencelessness' that such teaching differs from non-pacifist teaching. And when we turn to Mr. Maclachlan's pages we find much, well and truly said, with which Christian opinion would generally agree; on the other hand, the application of the 'defencelessness' of Jesus to Christian conduct in the modern world is a subject upon which many would differ from the 'Fellowship of Reconciliation.'

With Christ in God (S.P.C.K.; 15s. net), by Shirley C. Hughson, O.H.C., is sub-entitled 'A Study of Human Destiny.' The theme is broadly conceived, and is a rich devotional study in the Christian faith and experience, seeming to gather up the reflections of a lifetime. The author, who writes from the Holy Cross Monastery, West Park, N.Y., wants to disabuse certain minds of the idea that the Christian life consists in accepting certain articles of belief and conforming to a certain code of conduct. This, as he says, is an indispensable part of it, but the life 'in Christ' is to be conceived as 'a personal union with God,' and, as he adds, 'without this union no amount of intellectual acceptance, or mere following of codes of behaviour will suffice for that progressive sanctification which is necessary for attaining the ultimate destiny which God has prepared for every soul He creates.' Accordingly, this book is concerned with the ways that lead to 'progressive sanctification,' and in the description of them, so clear in its style, so soundly Scriptural in its basis, so devout in tone and feeling, the author covers a large part of the ground of Christian dogmatics and ethics, yet so as never to suggest to the reader that he is handling a text-book. One of the most rewarding features of the work, enhancing its devotional value, is the large use made of the writings (carefully documented) of certain Greek and Latin Fathers, notably St. Augustine and St. Bernard of Clairvaux, and indeed of representative Christian writings throughout the ages.

The Parish Priest at Work (S.P.C.K.: 12s. 6d. net), by the Rev. Charles R. Forder, is well described in the sub-title as 'An Introduction to Systematic Pastoralia.' For, in the first place, it is concerned with 'Pastoralia' in the sense of the principles of pastoral work and the technique of its practice; with everything indeed that the parish priest should know and do—except for the one matter of the nature of the priest's own inner life and the nourishment of it. This is here assumed to be part of the priest's preliminary concern before he approaches the practical problems of his ministry. In the second place, the book before us is 'systematic.' It is enough to cite the fivefold division: The Priest's Administration, Co-operative Administration, The Ministry to the Body Corporate, The Ministry to the Individual, Personal Considerations. And having cited the fivefold division, to note that under each division the sub-divisions are assembled with logical precision and meticulous care. No part of his subject appears to escape Mr. Forder's scrutiny, and the publishers' claim appears to be justified that his book 'gathers within one cover the essential information the parson needs for every side of his pastoral work.' Though the book is primarily intended for the priest of the Church of England, ministers of all denominations would doubtless find in it not only much to inform them but also much to help them in their pastoral activities. Most ministers have records to keep, business to transact, fabrics to care for, as well as services to conduct and visitations to make, not to speak of the multifarious 'contacts' they make in the fulfilment of their routine duties and tasks.

Church Union

By Professor Emeritus A. J. Gossip, D.D., LL.D., Glasgow.

A feature of the day is that many Christian people have become uneasy over that fissiparous tendency — so marked a characteristic of the Church's history—which has resulted in the mass of sects and denominations by which we find ourselves confronted. In that last fact, indeed, there is nothing new. Since, in Augustine's time, there seems to have been about as many, or even more, than there are now. But the feeling grows acute in many minds that this corporate disunity is a cause of derision to outsiders, who look at us amusedly, quote scoffingly, 'We are not divided; all one body we,' and go their jeering way; a source, too, of puzzledom to incomers from the other faiths who have no share in our heritage of disputations alien to their minds; and, indeed, a sheer foolishness since, instead of all pulling together in the one direction for the glory of God and the honour of Jesus Christ, we are largely wasting our energies in a kind of interdenominational tug-of-war against each other. Paul is now thought to have been much too complacent when, in the hubbub around him, he remarked that while some were preaching Christ from envy and contentiousness, 'What does it matter? Anyhow, Christ is being preached. And I rejoice in that. Yes; and I will rejoice.' He was, it is felt, facing the ugly facts much more squarely and honestly when, looking round him at the clamorous parties into which the Church was splitting—one proudly maintaining 'I belong to Paul,' another, 'I belong to Apollos,' a third, 'I belong to Peter,' a fourth, 'I belong to Christ'—he cried out in pain, 'Is Christ in fragments?' So our divisions, many are convinced, are a scandal. They must end.

In the last generation some practical and effective steps have been taken towards that goal. The Church of Scotland, for example, through union after union, has come together again into one solid whole, leaving only, numerically speaking, a few splinters outside the main body. In Canada a more daring and difficult union has been carried into being, though not so nearly unanimously. And in England and elsewhere others are taking shape, or are appearing in the offing. The young men see visions; the old men dream dreams. A year ago the Archbishop of Canterbury issued his appeal. In a few months at Amsterdam one hundred and twenty-five communions will declare the establishment of the World Council of Churches. The thing is in the air, like the coming of spring; and it fills many with a new hope.

But, thus far, the most dramatic happening has been the formation of the Church of South India by the fusing into one corporate entity of Anglicans, Methodists, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists: so, it is claimed, blazing the way which others ought to follow.

The record of this achievement is given us in detail in *Towards a United Church, 1913–1947* (Edinburgh House Press, 10s. 6d. net). It is written by a group of men of several different schools—a High Church Anglican, a Congregationalist, and so on—but all alike keen workers for a union, if that be possible, wide as the Church itself; but not, so they keep insisting, too mechanically uniform. It is a long story of thirty-four years of negotiation and disappointment and faith still moving resolutely toward an aim that more than once seemed to be proved unattainable.

The tale begins with the unhappy affair of Kikuyu, which in its day filled the churches with clamour, until the sudden din of the first World War drowned it, and men's attention turned elsewhere. Certain missionaries in Africa representing various churches, met together, held some tentative talks about the possibilities of a conceivable union, and ended by gathering around the Table of the common Lord. This Sacrament, though held in a Church of Scotland building, was celebrated by a bishop according to the Anglican rite. None the less the then Bishop of Zanzibar passionately protested against these proceedings, and demanded that two of his fellow bishops, who had been present, be tried for heresy.

With truculent dogmatism he laid it down 'that episcopacy is the organization selected by Christ,' and the ministry instituted by our Lord Himself 'as an essential element in His Church,' that 'we are compelled to admit episcopacy as the purpose and wish of the Christ Himself,' and are bound to give to Africa 'what the Saviour gave to a sin-bound world, namely His heavenly Manhood as the fountain of Grace, the Episcopate as the certain ministry of that Grace.' And, further, 'A man must be in loyal fellowship with the episcopate before he may receive the Holy Communion. It is of no avail to re-assert this truth hourly, and yet invite to the reception of

the Blessed Sacrament Christians who are in open rebellion to that Episcopate.' All which makes things very simple. Only—is it true ?

The Archbishop of Canterbury rejected the charges of heresy, but agreed it would be less than wise to repeat the united sacramental services !

Starting out from such an unpromising beginning, it is a bit of an achievement to have brought into being the Church of South India at all. All sides have made some concessions. But, in view of the facts that there are to be bishops, and that in process of time all its ministers will have been episcopally ordained, the Anglicans have given much the least. Still, in some ways, it is a notable endeavour that has been carried through, although so many edges are left ragged, and such wholly different interpretations have been given of the foundations upon which this Church is raised, that the chance of lasting peace seems poor, and most precarious.

Two matters strike one in the whole business. And the first is that the main obstacle to corporate union among the Protestant sects is that the Church of England holds so tenaciously, not only to the historic episcopate, but to its own modern interpretation of that phrase. For it did not always hold what it now holds. And that so doing, in spite of much acknowledgment that the Holy Spirit has been, and is, working through them, it does not admit that the churches round it are full churches, or their ministries full ministries, or their sacraments full sacraments. Quite frankly, to many in the churches so belittled this claim to a certain uniqueness seems nothing but a childish superstition, a silly and mechanical attempt to canalize the free grace of God, and a blasphemy against the Lord Jesus Christ. Do they believe that He is present at our Sacraments, distributing His grace to us with His own hands ? For, if so, who are they to turn their backs on Him, and to refuse to enter where He is ? If they do not, then they are wrong, as the experience of souls innumerable testify. For, as the Fathers of the Church of Scotland put it in their original Confession (1560) : ' We affirm that the faithful in the right use of the Lord's Table have such conjunction with Christ Jesus as the natural man can not comprehend.' And no hope of corporate union is going to induce us to deny or to belittle that. Times without number we have met the Lord Christ face to face. And, says Ignatius, ' Where Jesus Christ is, there is the whole Church ' ; and not merely some second-rate utility substitute for it. For, as Irenaeus put it, ' Where the Church is, there is the Spirit of God ; and where the Spirit of God is, there is the Church.'

Further, this high interpretation of the historic episcopate is dismissed by the best Church of England scholars as being utterly unwarranted by Scripture. So Lightfoot ; so Hort : ' There is no trace in the New Testament that any ordinances on this subject were prescribed by the Lord.' Or, again, ' Of officers higher than elders we find nothing that points to an institution or system, nothing like the episcopal system of later times.' Or Sanday, ' The whole position of the bishop was very similar to that of an incumbent of the parish church in one of our smaller towns. The parish system in the later sense with an extended diocese, and a number of more or less independent clergy circling round the bishop, does not grow up till the sixth to ninth centuries. In some respects the nonconformist communities of our own time furnish a closer parallel to the primitive state of things than an Established Church can possibly do.'

Or Headlam, that large-hearted man, in the very Bampton Lectures written to advocate reunion on the basis of episcopacy—' We cannot find any support for any particular theory of church polity in our Lord's teaching.' ' There is no Biblical authority for episcopacy.' And, of apostolic succession as the High Church understands it, ' So far as I can judge, it was not held at all in the Early Church.'

Or Streeter, in his summing up in *The Primitive Church*, ' In the Primitive Church there was no single system of Church Order laid down by the Apostles.' And he goes on to say that perhaps the greatest obstacle to union is ' the illusion that there is some one form of Church Order which alone is primitive, and which, therefore, alone possesses the sanction of apostolic precedent.' ' In the Primitive Church no one system of Church Order prevailed. Everywhere there was readiness to experiment, and, where circumstances seemed to demand it, to change.' And he adds, ' It may be that the line of advance for the Church to-day is, not to imitate the forms, but to recapture the spirit of the Primitive Church.'

In view of which last truth the South Indian adventure would seem to be commendable. For, blessed be His name, the Holy Spirit did not leave the world centuries ago, but is still in it, and still leading the Church, if it will listen and will follow.

Yet that is a doctrine that must be used not without caution. It may be that it was God's Holy Spirit that, down the ages, induced the Church at one time, so largely unanimously, to adopt Episcopacy. But was it, then, that same Spirit that led it on to Papacy ? To which the Anglican blandly replies : Your course is plain. You should not go further than I have gone. But you must come as far as I have come. We are

the model for the rest of you. And they will think of union only on that basis. All other systems of Church government must go. And theirs is to prevail, and become universal; slightly modified it may be, but essentially unchanged. It is not union that they advocate. It is absorption.

A bold claim, surely, in view of the facts, that, on the one hand, in the Bull *Apostolicæ Curæ* their own orders are condemned by Rome as utterly inadequate, so that there is no hope of union there; and, on the other, that in Protestantism, even in English-speaking Protestantism, they form a small minority. Thus Dr. Rushbrooke of the Baptist World Alliance: 'The communicant membership represented in a Baptist world congress is one-and-a-half times as numerous as that represented in a Lambeth conference'; and, limiting things to the English-speaking world, Baptist communicant members 'exceed by millions those of the Anglican communion.' If to these masses of Baptists there are added the further masses of Wesleyans, Congregationalists, and Presbyterians, the Anglican claim begins to look a little arrogant. And this the more since, in all courtesy be it spoken, to very many no system seems to work so ill or be so fatuous in actual practice as Episcopacy. When in open convocation the Archbishops of Canterbury and York denounce the teaching of the Bishop of Birmingham, and declare that, did they believe what he believes, they would have to resign, and he answers that he has no intention of resigning; and, with that, the matter drops, outsiders feel that either far too much was said, or much too little done. That is not church government, far less unity. It is chaos. The Church of Christ is more than a debating society. Why on earth should we adopt so futile a system? Yet we are told that we cannot have union upon any other terms.

Which brings one to a second thing that strikes one. 'Man is as the times are,' said Shakespeare. That is far truer than we realize. Much more than we understand we are the children of our day, with our minds coloured by the thought of the hour, and ourselves carried along by the pressure of the crowds around us, and drifting with the tides that happen to be running. And the ideal of the moment is to concuss us all into one pattern and one dull monotony of similarity, to dress our minds in one unvarying uniform, and teach us to think like soldiers on parade, our legs all going out with exact precision, and we ourselves turning as one man. It is a process by which very much is being lost. And is there not a danger that this union movement in the Church is a part of the prevailing mood, and not wholly commendable? An army does not lose because it is divided into different regiments, each with its own proud and glorious annals. These lesser loyalties and prides do not hamper, but aid the efficiency of the forces as a whole. And they are as natural as a man's love of his own country—and as resultful. Before long we may find that men are much less willing to give their lives for a vague blur called The United Nations than they have been to die for their own threatened countryside. So, whether it be deplorable or not, it is a fact that the Universal Church of Jesus Christ that so thrills some of us is too big and nebulous for others of us to see and think and feel and love. If they are to serve Christ's Church at all, it must be through their affection for that portion of it, through and in which Christ has done great things for them; the Church for which their fathers died.

In any case, men are most unlikely to think unanimously upon such matters as the best form of church polity and government; and to attempt to induce them to accept an unnatural uniformity with minor modifications is to ask for trouble. And it will come. It may be childish to worry about such things. It is more childish to exalt one way of them into an absolute requirement. For, says Augustine, 'It is the Christian religion that is necessary for salvation.' Only that. And so the New Testament sanctions different church systems, holding them to be immaterial.

Certainly the adoption of any one of them is no guarantee at all of unity and peace. From certain points of view there is something admirable in the way in which schools of thought far separated from each other all alike claim and find a home within the hospitable Church of England. Yet, from another angle, is not that simply another mode of saying that, under one type of church polity though they all are, there is small unity among them, but rather differences in doctrine and in modes of worship that are grave, and sometimes even fundamental; as the Archbishops' shocked repudiation of the teaching of their fellow Bishop, Dr. Barnes, makes plain. Between High Church and Low Church, between Evangelical and Modernist in the one Church of England there are wide and staring gaps that seem fully as broad as (or even broader than) those existing between, say, Methodists and Presbyterians—a fact sufficiently remarkable. For Wesley was a militant Arminian; and, historically, the Presbyterian churches are Calvinistic. Yet, nowadays, on occasion Methodists and Presbyterians enter each other's pulpits, and preach to one another's congregations; and are received as messengers from the Lord God Almighty in a way that is not common (is it?) between ritualistic Anglicans and

their Low Church brethren. Belonging to one church does not appear to help as much as it is thought: can leave us still open to the jeering of outsiders, and the wonder of incomers to the faith; there, too, we can dissipate our energies, pulling against one another. What is needed for real unity is something deeper and more fundamental; something that cannot be wrought out by ecclesiastical machinery and the like; a mellowing of the spirit, a widening of the heart.

That is the thesis of a little book just published by the Student Christian Movement Press—*The Church and the Churches*, by Miss K. L. Carrick Smith (7s. 6d. net), an excellent and most serviceable work, in which a fine idea is worked out with knowledge and skill, and above all, with a wide and enviable understanding which can get to the point of view of the most diverse churches and denominations, and state their case for them with sympathy and even a touch of enthusiasm. Miss Carrick Smith herself would appear to be an Anglican; and, as she well may be, and ought to be, proud of her church. Indeed at times she glides airily over the difficulties of the Anglican position as it seems to others. But this is quite unconsciously. For she has an honest and trustworthy mind. Part One is on 'Our Fundamental Differences,' dealing with The Grounds of Belief, The Basis of Church Membership, The Nature of the Ministry, Sacraments, and Ways of Worship; setting down what these things mean to the various churches. And in Part Two she seeks to tell us what is characteristic and vital in Catholic Piety, in Anglicanism, and in the truths that the Presbyterians, the Congregationalists, the Baptists, the Society of Friends, the Methodists have stood for, and have emphasized.

She, too, is all for union; but of another kind than that which we have been considering. Her point of view may be stated in this from the Preface: 'The attempt to modify the diverse branches of the Christian Church until they form but one organ is like trying to find the Lowest Common Multiple of eye, ear, hand, and mouth. It cannot be done: and, if it could, the result would not be a living body, the agent for the doing of God's wise and loving will. For much of the value of the churches lies in their distinctive natures. The truth revealed in Christ Jesus has proved itself, in every age, too wide and deep to be expressed in any one pattern of life or worship.' Or in this from her conclusion: 'No one can deny that Anglicans tend to split into three parties and set off in different directions, so that central Anglicanism is hardly to be found; while the Non-conformist churches, in a genuine rediscovery of the spiritual values to be found in other traditions, are in danger of forgetting the religious significance of their own. And assimilation in what may be called the media of religion is something altogether different from unity in Christ; that unity has to be found at a very much deeper level, and, when found, it will be a power and a flame that will kindle throughout the world the spirit of love and reconciliation. Sincere though our efforts are to find the grounds of agreement between Christians, we are not even within the kingdom of heaven where the hidden treasure lies. We are like children, who, playing with a paint-box, decide to try the effect of mixing all the colours together in the hope that some dazzling super-colour will result; they are disappointed when they find themselves left with a dirty mixture between grey and brown.'

Or in this quotation from Selbie: 'Among all true Christians, that is all men and women who trust in Him for salvation, there is a unity of spirit which nothing can disturb, and which would not in any way be enhanced by the inclusion of all in one vast organization.'

It is that that we have got to cultivate and deepen. After all, the Lord Christ told us that there will be one flock and one Shepherd; but He did not add one fold. And when He prayed—and how grievously we all still need it—that we all may be one as He and the Father are one, surely He was not thinking of external things—mainly, if at all—but asking that we might exorcise out of our hearts obscurantism and narrow-mindedness, might gain some sense of proportion, putting secondary things into their secondary place and stressing what is primary and fundamental; might, as the first apostles allowed, govern Christ's Church as seems best to us and most to His glory, but welcoming to our place of worship which is His House, and to our sacraments, where He is host, all friends and followers of His, whatever be their own denomination; as, indeed, my own church gladly does. 'Holy Scripture,' say the Church of England Articles, 'containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation.' Let us leave it at that.

And Christ Himself has given us in words that could not be simpler or plainer, what He esteems in us and claims from us; what is to Him the mark and proof of a genuinely Christian Church—'By this shall all men know that ye are my disciples, if ye love one another.'

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

Join the Courtesy Club.

By the Reverend C. P. Goslin, A.K.C., Corley, Coventry.

'Be courteous.'—1 P 3^{8}.

Churches are not the only places to-day where we can benefit from sermons. The bus people are determined to preach to us also. I expect you've seen the picture on the bus window lately of Raleigh spreading his cloak on the mud for Queen Elizabeth to tread upon, and the text at the side, 'Courtesy brightens life.' Or on some other journey another picture and notice has caught your attention—'There's always time for courtesy.'

The fifth Girl Guide Law is 'A guide is courteous.' St. Peter, the rough, impetuous fisherman, has been so transformed by the impact of Jesus upon his life that he writes to his Christian friends, 'Be pitiful, be courteous.' And the transport people are supporting a Courtesy Campaign. So Scripture, the Girl Guides, and modern transport all conspire to say to us 'Be courteous.'

The word 'courtesy' is interesting. It begins with five letters which spell 'court,' and that's a clue to its meaning. Courtesy is the behaviour expected of those who belong to a sovereign's court. The higher the station in life, the more of graciousness and thought for others is expected. So the meaning of Christian courtesy is what is expected of the person who moves in the highest society of all—the Presence of the King of Kings.

We can all recognize courtesy when we see it. There's a prayer: 'Give us a quick eye for little kindnesses, that we may be ready in doing them, and gracious in receiving them.' That's courtesy. And there's a Psalm which asks the question: 'Lord, who shall dwell in thy tabernacle: or who shall rest upon thy holy hill?' That is—what is the behaviour expected of those who frequent God's Presence? And the Psalm answers its own question and says, 'He that setteth not by himself, but is lowly in his own eyes: and maketh much of them that fear the Lord.' That's courtesy.

But while courtesy is clear for all to see, it springs from something unseen. Just as the leaves and fruit of a tree are obvious to all, but are due to the fact that the roots of the tree go deep and imbibe nourishment from the soil. Courtesy—true Christian courtesy—springs from a heart of love. Gandhi was a loyal Hindu, but he was appreciative of the beauty of other religions. He liked to have read to him, for example, passages from the Christian Scriptures. One of his favourite chapters was 1 Corinthians 13, in praise of charity. He expressed its teaching in his life, for Gandhi suffered long and was kind. Courtesy is a fruit of love.

We need to be trained in ways of courtesy. We should always be grateful to those who try to cure us of bad manners. And as we grow older, we should try to form the habit of gracious behaviour, with its recognition of the feelings of others and a readiness to help them in little things as well as in big. But our best education in courtesy will be in the school of Jesus, spending time with Him in prayer and reading about His life. For Jesus was Courtesy personified. If we had met a leper He had cleansed, we should have found him grateful not simply for the cure, but still more for the *way* Jesus had done it. He made a man feel he mattered. The touch of Jesus was one not only of power but of love.

Some seven miles from our village is a big town. When we meet its boundary we see a notice on the road: 'X is a safety town.' Under that is a big triangle, and on the triangle are printed these words: 'Join the Courtesy Club.' Shall we?

Clyde-Built.

By the Reverend J. A. Needham, Anniesland, Glasgow.

'Whose builder and maker is God.'—He 11^{10}.

A few months ago there was, in the Glasgow Art Gallery, a 'Clyde-Built' Exhibition. Models of many ships—sailing vessels and others, from the *Comet*, the first steam-powered paddle-boat, to H.M.S. *Howe*, and the latest oil-burning ships. They delighted the eye of every boy.

The Exhibition was full of interest. The models were a reminder of a great industry, and spoke to us of honest workmanship. Scotland, and Clyde-side in particular, can be proud of its achievements in this line. If the *Queen Mary* and the *Queen Elizabeth* and the *Vanguard* could think and speak, they would be proud of being Clyde-built, just as many Glasgow lads, during the War, far from home, were not ashamed of letting every one know where they came from—where they 'belonged.' And if three or four of them were together they would sing lustily, 'I belong to Glasgow.' If these great ships had the power of thought and speech, they, too, would be proud of their birthplace. It is good to have this pride, providing we do not disparage other people and places, providing we justify our boast by trying to make 'our' city more worthy of the honour of all her future sons.

Not only were there models of famous ships on view, but models of smaller and more insignificant ships had their place. And they are important. Even tugs, which make more smoke and noise than speed, have their jobs to do. They helped to pull the mighty *Queen Elizabeth* off a sandbank not long ago. That was something which even the powerful engines of the famous liner could not accomplish on their own. Big ships and little

ships, mighty liners and squat tug-boats, had their place in the Exhibition—all full of interest.

Being an Englishman, I had a smile when I went to see this Exhibition of Clyde-Built ships. There was a model of Noah's Ark on view. That was the first time I had ever heard the suggestion that the *Ark* was built on the Clyde. (The model was so built, even if the original was not.)

We are all proud of the great ships built on the Clyde—whether we belong here, or whether we only live here because our job called us to this area. There is something in which we can have a greater pride—to belong to Christ's Church and the Kingdom of God, being built on the lines and the specifications of the New Testament, allowing God to build and make us what He wants us to be. It would be good to hear more people singing, 'I belong to Jesus Christ.' That is something to boast about. If you can sing this, if you are being built on these lines, you will be able to weather any storm that comes.

Yes, there was much of interest, and much of which to be proud in the Clyde-Built Exhibition. On the day I went to the Exhibition I was somewhat disappointed. There was no model of the *Queen Mary*, no model of the *Queen Elizabeth*, no model of the *Vanguard*. There was no model of the finest ship (to me)—the one that brought me home from India after some years' absence. My disappointment led me to think on this line: if we are not included in Christ's Church, in the Kingdom of God, many people who have an interest in us are going to be very disappointed—and the Lord Jesus Himself will be the most disappointed of all.

The Christian Year.

THIRD SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

The Discipline of Loneliness.

BY THE REVEREND GEORGE JOHNSTONE JEFFREY, D.D., GLASGOW.

'And ye now therefore have sorrow: but I will see you again, and your heart shall rejoice, and your joy no man taketh from you.'—Jn 16^{22}.

These are among the last words of Jesus to His disciples and they fill their minds with sad perplexity. He is using cryptic language about leaving them. 'A little while, and ye shall *not* see me: and again, a little while, and ye *shall* see me.' It is all so disturbing. They have the sinking feeling of children about to be bereft of a mother. It was to this state of deep anxiety that Jesus was now ministering. He would indeed leave them. In a few hours He would disappear into the black darkness of Golgotha. Out of this He would reappear in the Resurrection glory. Then they would see Him no more with the eye of the body. But at last He would fill their hearts for ever with the Pentecostal blessedness.

Now we all have these seasons of bleak separation from Christ. As *Screwtape* has it, 'The nearest approach to constancy is undulation—a series of troughs and peaks.' It is well to come to terms with ourselves on this matter. Again and again in life we must be prepared for spiritual 'dryness,' when the soul is conscious of a great loneliness. We are not to expect a sense of unbroken fellowship with Christ. '*Me, ye have not always*' are significant words. The truth is, the spiritual life would lose much of its romance if it were one long uninterrupted flow. We would be deprived of much of the soul's education in walking by faith and not by sight. An illuminating Old Testament text leaps into the mind here. 'I will extend peace to her *like a river*.' A river is not a tame unadventurous, unchanging thing, like a canal. It is for ever changing, at times in full spate, at times flowing smoothly, at times nothing more than a dry, parched channel. 'So is every one that is born of the Spirit.'

Now Jesus has three things to say that reassure us in these seeming derelictions. The first is that *His withdrawals are temporary, not permanent.* 'I will see you again.' Separation from the beloved is always hard to bear. In the story of the human heart, it is the theme of a thousand love songs.

> What's this dull town to me?
> Robin's not here.

But we are dealing here with a far more intimate relationship—the closest of all—the soul's tryst with God. There is no irony and no dejection like trying to live the Christian life without Christ. It is one thing to face life on a tidal wave of prosperity, good health, outward success, with the goodwill of many friends to cheer us on. It is quite another to face a day with a heart of lead, bankrupt of feeling, forced to make our bricks without straw. Strange and mysterious are the moods and circumstances that combine to banish from us the heartening Presence of the Son of God. The tired body, the depleted nerves, the racking over-busyness, these and other causes take the sun out of our heavens. The hymn writer puts on the lips of Samuel Rutherford words most of us can understand.

> The flowers need night's cool darkness,
> The moonlight, and the dew.
> So Christ from one who loved Him
> His shining oft withdrew.
> And then for cause of absence
> My troubled soul I scanned,
> But glory, shadeless, shineth
> In Immanuel's land.

Now the disciples had to learn the lesson we also have to rescue out of these seasons of separation, that it is just in such a period of emotional penury that we add cubits to our spiritual stature. War writes its memorable commentary on this kind of situation. The Christian soldier, like the man in the Army, is not asked 'if he feels like going over the top this morning.' Churchill struck a heroic note for us all in the long-drawn-out sickness of hope deferred when he asked the nation to live through it in such a spirit that a thousand years hence men would say, 'This was

Britain's finest hour.' The inference is plain. Happy is the man who can hold to it dourly and bravely in the days when he seems to be cut off from all the sources of inspiration and hope. It is one of the great disciplines of life and it works wonders in the forging of a finely tempered Christian character. How often has it happened to the poorest of us that, when we have fared forth to grapple with repugnant duty with a sinking heart, we found ourselves at the end of the day with the same heart 'strangely warmed.' 'I will see you again.' 'I will not leave you comfortless.' Their name is legion who can testify that this is ever the Master's way with the brave hearted.

When I see day succeed the deepest night,
How can I speak but as I know: my speech
Must be throughout the darkness, 'It will end.
The light that *did* burn, *will* burn.'

There is another kind of loneliness. We might call it the loneliness of desertion. One of Christ's listeners was shortly to know its sheer wretchedness—the Apostle Peter. It is only too possible to cut ourselves off from the joy of Christ's presence by some base apostasy.

But it is the glory of the gospel that when we doom ourselves to this soul-sickness we may also experience, as never before, *the joy of recovery*. We may have known this discipline in the physical sphere. For weeks—it may be months—illness has imprisoned us within the four walls of a room. But at long last the day comes when we step forth into God's great out-of-doors, and breathe the healthful air once more.

See the Wretch, that long has tost
On the thorny bed of Pain,
At length repair his vigour lost,
And breathe and walk again:
The meanest flowret of the vale,
The simplest note that swells the gale,
The common Sun, the air, the skies,
To him are opening Paradise.

But there is a holier rapture—dear to every sensitive spirit. It is the joy of spiritual restoration. What a moment it was for the repentant Peter, after his avalanche of tears and the gloom of being separated from One whom he loved with a great passion of devotion, when Christ uttered the words of reinstatement and reconciliation. 'Feed my sheep.' 'Feed my lambs.' 'I will see you again.' 'Your heart shall rejoice.' Christ is ever true to His Word.

How real is the separation of a troubled conscience! All who are versed in the Brontë story will remember the irresistible impulse which took Charlotte back to Brussels for the second time against the warnings of her own conscience and common sense. 'For my selfish folly,' she wrote to her friend, 'I was punished by a withdrawal for more than two years of happiness and peace of mind.' These words strike a chord. How many of us, were we honest men, would be forced to confess that we too, for some inordinate desire, have cut ourselves off from the serenity of walking quietly with God. And is there any loneliness like it in the world? Well might the hymn writer say for us in our sadness:

Our midnight is Thy smile withdrawn,
Our noontide is Thy gracious dawn.

Our mortal sickness were worth while if it burned into us the lasting conviction that Christ is the Great Indispensable. Looking back on his spiritual life the poet Addison saw this kind of thing happening again and again, and it filled him with a glowing sense of gratitude. He had known this healing power, both in body and in soul.

When worn with sickness, oft hast thou
With health renewed my face,
And when in sins and sorrows sunk,
Revived my soul with grace.

We, too, have known the joy of recovery, when we have rooted out of our life that evil thing on which God's holy eye may not rest, when, as far as we know our own hearts we have cut off any and everything that made it easy for us to walk once more the way of folly and sin, and, by the grace of Christ's forgiving love, we set out once more to choose the better part and to be the children of the light and the day. 'I will see you again, and your heart shall rejoice.'

And your joy no man can take from you. That is a great claim to make. The poet speaks of 'Joy, whose hand is ever at his lips bidding adieu.' And that is true of many an earthly joy. Human friendships may end in estrangement, or distance separates us.

But seas between us braid hae roar'd
Sin' auld lang syne.

Amidst all these transitory things of earth the friendship of Christ abides. Is there anything in life that makes it thrill with a great comforting reassurance like the thought of a Love that greets us in childhood and becomes more dear and sacred and satisfying till the mortal mists shall gather over our eyes.

Through Him the first fond prayers are said
Our lips of childhood frame,
The last low whispers of our dead
Are burdened with His name.

Is this blessedness a real thing in our lives or is all this mere rhapsody? Is Jesus Christ but a dim receding figure, fading away into the centuries, merely a spiritual seer whom we reverence and whose high behests we strive, with but poor success, to put into action? Or is ours the joy of daily converse with One who, by His Indwelling Spirit, fills our life with intuitions it were our perfidy to refuse, with heavenly visions it were dishonour to disobey? If such a companionship, such a wondrous sense of direction and undergirding is not real, then there is nothing true in heaven and in earth. Back then to life, to its strangely contrasted experience of elation and despair, to its peaks and troughs, its sicknesses

and recoveries, its emotional fullness and penury, in the thraldom of Him who gives us the right to say, 'I am persuaded, that neither death, nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor things to come, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus our Lord.'

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

What is Truth?

BY THE REVEREND PRINCIPAL H. F. LOVELL COCKS, M.A., D.D., BRISTOL.

'Pilate saith unto him, What is truth?'—Jn 18^{38}.

Who was this man Pontius Pilate? Let us try to get a clear picture of him as he sits on his judgment seat with the prisoner standing before him. Pilate was a man of the middle class, who held this post of Procurator of Judaea for ten years—an unusually long period. He had gained the hatred of the Jewish people when he took the Temple funds to defray the cost of an aqueduct, and again when he allowed the Roman soldiers to carry their standards into Jerusalem. There had been riots and Jewish blood had been spilt. These were bad blunders, due to Pilate's inability to understand the religious susceptibilities of this strange Jewish people. And with these scored against him Pilate was naturally sensitive about his standing with Tiberius, his imperial master. We may picture him, then, as a Roman civil servant, neither better nor worse than other provincial administrators, not naturally cruel but unimaginative, contemptuous of the Jews yet secretly afraid of them and their incalculable religious frenzies—a man neither specially good nor specially bad, a very ordinary man, in fact—just like you or me.

This was the man before whom Jesus was brought to be tried. Pilate did not want to be bothered with the business at all. Here, evidently, was no guerilla leader, no Barabbas. Pilate had plenty of experience of men like Barabbas, and knew what to do with them. But this Galilean was harmless enough. As far as Roman law went, there was simply no case against Him. For who could take seriously this nonsense about His being the King of the Jews? Probably the whole thing was an invention of the priests and scribes, who were jealous of the Man. Yet Pilate knew that the claim to kingship, magnified and distorted in some secret report of this Chief Priest to the suspicious Tiberius, would appear in a very different light. 'Thou art not Caesar's friend'—that was a hint too plain to be disregarded. The wonder is not that Pilate crucified Jesus, but that he tried so hard to release Him. After all, Jesus was not a Roman citizen—like Paul, who could and did appeal to Caesar over the heads of provincial governors. He was only a peasant from Galilee, a man of little account. Yet He was innocent, and Pilate knew it, and said so. And being innocent He was entitled to acquittal—and Pilate knew that too, and honestly tried to release Him. But in the end he crucified Him.

Pilate, I said, was an ordinary man, just like one of us. Are we so sure that we should have acted differently if we had been in Pilate's place? We see these events through the halo of the Christian centuries, and know that the Man before Pilate was the only-begotten Son of God and the Saviour of mankind. But Pilate did not know this, and could not be expected to know it. To him, Jesus, though obviously no criminal, was a nuisance, an embarrassment. But Jesus is often a nuisance and an embarrassment to men. If only He came at those hours when we are ready to receive Him and able to give Him our worship and obedience! But He does not wait until we are at leisure from the world and have prepared ourselves by prayer and meditation for His coming. He comes to us when we are very busy and full of cares, when we have no time to attend to Him—when, indeed, we are so preoccupied that we fail to recognize Him. Surely it is not His presence that manifests itself in the competing claims of duty and inclination; it cannot be His call that comes to us muffled in the ordinariness of daily circumstances and the matter of fact of our earthly life? But it is He. For this is the very pattern of the Incarnation, that the King disguises Himself in the homespun garments of a peasant so that only an obedient faith can know Him for what He is. Yes, we are like Pilate in this.

Pilate was not what we should call a religious man. And, in any case, he would have been unable to make sense of the claim of Jesus to be the Messiah, the King of the Jews. And to-day, though Christ has been proclaimed King for two thousand years, there are many who can make no sense of what the Church affirms about her Lord. Men tell us that they are not sure of God's existence—let alone the divinity of Jesus. When we tell them that to every man Christ daily, hourly comes with His claim and His promise, they are as bewildered and incredulous as Pilate. 'What is truth?'—our secular generation echoes Pilate's question. What is truth, and where is it to be found? How can we know that Jesus really is what He claims to be?

We Christians know that Truth incarnate was standing before Pontius Pilate. But Pilate's eyes could not be opened to see the glory of the incarnate Son of God until he had to come to terms with another, more commonplace truth already revealed to him. Pilate did not know who Jesus was, but he did know that Jesus was innocent and ought to be released. In Jesus every wrongfully accused man was pleading for justice. Hard Roman as he was, Pilate had a conscience. 'Release the man,' said his conscience. In the end, Pilate sent Jesus forth to Calvary, and crucified Him and his own conscience there. Had Pilate dared the Jews to do their worst and released Jesus, he would not thereby have become a Christian believer, but he would have taken the first step on the road of faith. History repeats itself. Before every man stands this strange Christ with His majestic calm and unspoken

claim; and still men are puzzled, as Pilate was puzzled, what to make of Him and what to do with Him. 'What is truth?' they cry. 'We do not understand your creeds and your theologies.' But Pilate was judged, as we shall be judged, not because he did not fall down and worship Jesus as Divine, but because he was false to his conscience; not because he did not respond to the Truth he could not understand, but because he was disobedient to the truth he already knew. That he crucified the Son of God was his blunder; that he crucified his conscience was his sin.

Many legends gather round the figure of this Roman governor. Sometimes Christian piety has pictured his repentance and conversion. Sometimes it has imagined Pilate the victim of a remorse like that of Judas who went out and slew himself. But perhaps an unbeliever has come nearest to the truth here—Anatole France, in his short story *The Procurator of Judaea*. Pontius Pilate, an old man now and in retirement, is visited by a friend. In the course of their conversation the friend speaks of a young wonder-worker from Galilee: '"He was named Jesus; He came from Nazareth, and was put on the Cross for I don't know what crime. Pontius, do you remember the man?" Pontius Pilate knitted his brows and put his hand on his forehead like a man searching his memory. Then, after several moments of silence: "Jesus!" he murmured, "Jesus of Nazareth? I do not remember."'

That is the tragedy—the tragedy of the man who does not know what he has done and does not know what he has missed; who cannot remember that the Son of God stooped down to him with help and healing and forgiveness; who misses the glory of the Lord because he dare not walk by the light he already has. God save us all from that bitterness.

Come, lest this heart should, cold and cast away,
Die ere the guest adored she entertain;
Lest eyes which never saw thy earthly day,
Should miss thy heavenly reign.

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

Fit for the Kingdom.

BY THE REVEREND RODERICK BETHUNE, M.A., EDINBURGH.

'No man, having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God.'—Lk 9^{62}.

It becomes increasingly evident as one reads the Gospels that Jesus did not accept every offer of service which was made to Him. He rejected some because they came from people who quite obviously had failed to realize all that His service involved, and He rejected others because they were attended by certain conditions or certain reservations. In an endeavour to make clear the type of man who was of little use to Him, says Luke, He bade His audience (which may well have been composed of men and women of the farming class) think of a ploughman engaged to plough a field and who, in the midst of his work, looked back. Such a man was of little use to his employer, His audience knew. And the same type of man, He wanted them to know, was of little use to Him.

1. The first thing His figure of a man ploughing a field and looking back suggests to one's mind is one who tires of routine work. For a furrow or two he maintains his early enthusiasm—but, faced by the prospect of ploughing many such furrows, he loses heart and ceases his activity.

In every walk of life, in every profession and trade you care to think of, much routine work falls to be done—and, in every profession and in every trade, men and women grow weary of doing the same thing day after day. They may continue to push their duties through since they know that, if they would keep themselves and their dependants alive, they must push them through, but they discharge them with little interest or enthusiasm.

As there were men who, in the pursuit of their respective avocations, grew weary discharging the same daily duties, so, Jesus knew, there would be men and women who would grow tired of the duties which His discipleship entailed and which, if His cause were to triumph, simply had to be fulfilled. And who among us, with any knowledge of ourselves and of our neighbours, will dare to say that He was mistaken? Men and women will take office in the Church, or teach in the Sunday School, or sing in the choir—for a time, but, after a while, because their work is unattended by anything spectacular, because it involves doing the same thing week in, week out, they begin to do it spasmodically and, finally, not at all.

William Carey, who began life as a shoemaker, or, as he himself described himself on a memorable occasion, as a cobbler, became a missionary who, in the course of his service, acquired a working knowledge of many languages. Questioned one day concerning his linguistic gifts, he disclaimed any unusual abilities. 'I am no genius,' he said, 'but I can plod.' That is the type of man whom Jesus wanted and still wants—the man of many gifts and the man of few gifts who can plod and who is prepared to plod for the sake of accomplishing some appointed task; the man who, however dull and flat and monotonous the duties appointed him within Jesus' kingdom may be, is prepared to fulfil them faithfully and well. Without that type of man there is not a home, not a business, not a society which will exist for long. And without that type of man there is not a Church that will exist for long. 'No man,' said Jesus, 'having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God.'

2. The second thing which Jesus' figure of a man ploughing a field and looking back suggests is one who loses direction and who, because he loses direction, performs his task less successfully than it should be performed. There could not have been a man listening to Jesus who did not know that, if a man would plough his field aright, he must keep his eye upon some distant mark. In His work, as in every other work, there would be the temptation to give only divided attention,

there would be difficulties which would spoil a man's original enthusiasm and deflect him from his original aim, but the man He wanted, the man who was of most use to Him, was he who resisted every temptation to turn aside and whose enthusiasm remained unspoilt whatever difficulties might be encountered.

It is a far cry to Jesus' day, but the temptation to turn aside from Jesus' service, and the difficulties which are apt to dim a man's original enthusiasm, are still very real. How many there are who serve Jesus Christ with divided attention or who allow themselves to be deflected from their original purpose by the difficulties which beset them! In Christian service, as in every other form of service, the man who counts, the man who more than any other is responsible for advancing the cause, is he who suffers nothing to come between him and the performance of his appointed task. In his biography of J. A. Spender, the distinguished editor of *The Westminster Gazette*, Mr. Wilson Harris pays a tribute to his achievements in spite of the difficulties which might well have hindered their accomplishment. Spender, he tells us, had his fixed time of seventy-five minutes for writing his leader. But Spender was editor as well as his own leader-writer, and therefore could not count on being left to his work undisturbed. Problems arose in the office, an important piece of news came in suddenly and its treatment had to be decided, some visitor too weighty or too potentially useful to be denied audience presented himself—all within the nominally sacred hour-and-a-quarter. And yet, says Wilson Harris, the leader got written.

It is that spirit which Jesus wished to see in men and women who put their hands to His service—the spirit which, in spite of everything, gets things done.

If some, face to face with difficulties, think I am asking a loyalty and a devotion from them which no minister, because he knows nothing of their particular difficulties, is called upon to manifest, it would be well for such to remember that, if a minister knows nothing of their difficulties, he has difficulties of his own which are just as real and just as potentially dangerous. 'How hard it is,' says the Dean of St. Paul's, 'to keep the love of God and of His people alive year after year in the same little place; how hard to remain cheerful and keen when the parish is steadily indifferent; how hard to sympathize with others when poverty and anxiety are in one's own house'—but, hard as such things are, they are what Jesus asks. 'No man,' He said, thinking of all of us, 'having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God.'

3. But the third thing which Jesus' figure of a man ploughing a field and looking back suggests is a man who has failed to consecrate himself wholly to his task. That type of man, Jesus wished men to know, was of little use to Him. If men and women would enlist in His service, then He wanted all of them, everything they had, all their gifts and qualities to be fully dedicated to the furtherance of His cause.

In Mr. Ellis Roberts' biography of Dick Sheppard tribute is paid time and again to the unmeasured service which he rendered. 'He spent himself upon other people,' a Canon of Canterbury Cathedral once declared. 'He just gave himself away. To watch him and to know what sort of health, what sort of nights he went through, and see him going on, was a thing that made one think of our Lord speaking of people eating His flesh and drinking His blood: of our Lord wanting people to do something which could be called That!' Some, as they watched him serve were openly critical of him, of course. 'He had no right to be so reckless, so stupidly careless of the elementary rules which govern fatigue and strain,' said a doctor, for example. 'But that,' says Sheppard's biographer, 'is a point of view. A man with that point of view will be able to do good work in his way for a long time, but he will never be to men as if the Crucified were suddenly among them.'

When one thinks of the kind of men and women Jesus Christ wanted and the kind of men and women He has sometimes been fortunate enough to get, one feels the poverty of one's own service and the tasks which one has performed inadequately or left undone because of their demands. 'No man,' we have need to hear Jesus say, 'having put his hand to the plough, and looking back, is fit for the kingdom of God.' There is only one way by which the world can be won, and that is by every one of us devoting every gift we have to the world's only Saviour. There is no other way.

A reviewer of Lord Elton's book, *Imperial Commonwealth*, in which the story of the British Empire is told, declares that he wondered, having read the book, whether we have men and women to-day capable of maintaining what other men have won. A similar thought enters one's mind when one thinks of the men and women whom Jesus Christ wants and whom He has sometimes been fortunate enough to secure: Are there men and women fit for the Kingdom of God in our day and generation? I think there are—and it is up to us, wherever we may have been placed, to swell their number.

SUNDAY AFTER ASCENSION.

The Comfort and Challenge of the Ascension.

BY THE REVEREND PHILIP W. LILLEY, M.A., RHU, DUNBARTONSHIRE.

'Seeing then that we have a great high priest, that is passed into the heavens, Jesus the Son of God, let us hold fast our profession.'—He 4^{14}.

Do we experience the joy and comfort of Ascensiontide as we should? For if we do not, we certainly fall far short of the quiet confidence which filled the hearts of the early disciples. After they saw their Master carried up into heaven, 'they worshipped him, and returned to Jerusalem with great joy: and were continually in the temple, praising and blessing God.' Christ withdrew from the sight of men's eyes in order that

He might satisfy the deepest needs of their souls. As St. Augustine wrote: 'He departed from our eyes that we should return to our own hearts and find Him there. He would not tarry long with us, yet did He never leave us.'

But is not this what all Christians are entitled to realize? And is there any Festival of the Christian Church so rich in assurance for the worshipping heart as this one? What James Denney says so strikingly of the experience of St. Paul is equally true for the humblest worshipper —'Christ on the throne is a more immediate certainty than Jesus on the banks of the lake or even Jesus on the Cross.' For this reason surely that even after the Resurrection Christ could only be at one Emmaus at a time: but since His Ascension He is at a thousand, and the heart burns with joy at each as it realizes His presence. The Ascension, in a word, is the crown of the whole Christian revelation. Of a truth the Resurrection is incomplete without the Ascension, for the Ascension marks Christ's coronation and enthronement and heavenly reign.

Ascensiontide is then a reminder to us of certain assurances and blessed hopes. Let us grapple them to our souls in this day of tumult and deep unrest.

1. First, the Ascension proclaims *the victory of the Conquering Christ.* The twenty-fourth Psalm, which is an appropriate Psalm for Ascension Day, gives us a figurative and picturesque setting. It depicts a victorious king coming to an ancient fortress and demanding its surrender. 'Open the gates that the king of glory may come in' is the cry that is raised outside the hoary pile. The Church of Christ laid hold on this Psalm and sang it with exuberant joy and steadfast faith, just as it sings it to-day. Why does it sing also many others, such as 'Crown Him Lord of all,' 'Crown Him with many crowns, the Lamb upon His Throne'? It is because it believes that 'Jesus is Lord,' which is the shortest, simplest, and most complete confession of the Christian Church.

How much this conviction regarding the imperial triumph of the Lord meant in constraining power and in resultant victory to the early followers it is not easy to assess. But is not this the vision and this the conviction which we still need to cherish? Even in our churches to-day there is a woeful and widespread pessimism with regard to the future of the world and the victory of the Kingdom of God. Yet there is solid ground for optimism, if we lift up our hearts to the Conquering Christ. For Christ is not on the Cross but on the Throne. For Christians there is but one Leader of whom it may be said without any exaggeration that He has the situation well in hand. During the last War, when our hopes were long deferred, our statesmen tried to encourage the nation by saying of this or that event, 'This is perhaps the turning-point in the whole contest.' We forget at times that there was One who long ago never used that ambiguous word 'perhaps,' but in a fateful hour calmly said, 'Courage, I have overcome the world.' So at the Ascension the issue of the age-long war of wars—the war against sin—was settled once for all. And however long the struggle may still last, there is no doubt who shall win. Therefore the key-note of the Christian life as it is related to the Ascended Christ is one of victory and triumph. 'Now we see not yet all things put under him. But we see Jesus . . . crowned with glory and honour.' When John Wesley was on his death-bed he sang (and the words might well be a battle-song for to-day):

All glory to God in the sky,
And peace upon earth be restored!
O Jesus, exalted on high,
Appear our omnipotent Lord!

Thou only art able to bless,
And make the glad nations obey,
And bid the dire enmity cease,
And bow the whole world to Thy sway.

It is the men (like Wesley) who have believed in the eventual victory of Jesus Christ who have gained for Him that measure of supremacy He has won, yet they would be the first to say that it was He who wrought it through them.

2. The Ascension gives us also the assurance that *Christ is the Comforter of the sorrowful.* He is able to impart strong and true comfort because of His unique endowments—His eternal humanity, and His perfect sympathy. He is our great High Priest 'touched with the feeling of our infirmities,' and 'made like unto his brethren.' The Jewish high priest, that lonely figure, entered into the holy of holies to make atonement; but he was aloof from men. Christ became a merciful and faithful High Priest and imparts His full and perfect sympathy, because of His full human experience. He shared not only our nature, but our experience. He went through all the various stages of man's life as we do. He has now the capacity for sympathy and appreciation which can be bought only with a great price. He learned obedience by the things which He suffered. It was thus that His education in sympathy was perfected.

In one of his poems A. E. Housman thus peremptorily addresses the Lord:

But if, the grave rent and the stone rolled by,
At the right hand of majesty on high
You sit, and sitting so remember yet
Your tears, your agony and bloody sweat,
Your cross and passion and the life you gave,
Bow hither out of heaven and see and save.

Christ does 'see and save.' He has not forgotten what it felt like to go through loneliness and terror and pain. To how many living in concentration camps He must have spoken in words like these: 'I know where thou dwellest, even where Satan's seat is; and thou holdest fast My name, and hast not denied My faith.'

Though now ascended up on high,
He bends on earth a brother's eye;
. . . . . .
He sympathizes with our grief,
And to the sufferer sends relief.

3. Finally in the Ascension we hear the voice of *Christ the Challenger*; Christ conquers, Christ comforts, yes, and Christ challenges.

And this is the short dramatic command He gives—'Go ye therefore, and teach all nations.' In effect He says: 'You are to be My witnesses in this confused and wicked world. If you believe in Me, you must also believe in My programme.' A Church which has no mission in the world is not a Church worthy of the name.

You remember the beautiful old legend which describes how the archangel Gabriel met the Lord at the gates of heaven, when He returned at His Ascension from His mission on earth. Gabriel asked Christ, 'Lord, what have you achieved? What results have you left behind you yonder?' 'I have eleven men who believe in Me,' replied Jesus. 'Is that all, Lord?' And Jesus answered, 'That is all.' 'But,' continued Gabriel, 'but what, Lord, if they should fail you? Are you not risking defeat by committing so much to them? What if their loyalty should break?' 'I know them,' said Jesus, 'they are My men, and they will not fail.'

There is an eternal truth at the heart of this old story, and there is, moreover, a challenge here which still comes inevitably to the heart and conscience of the true disciple. The Ascended Christ is trusting us to-day, as He trusted His men long ago. He is calling to us to be up and doing. Surely we shall not fail so generous, and so magnanimous a trust as this. Since these things are so, let us hold fast our profession.

For Christ has no hands but our hands to do His work to-day,
He has no feet but our feet to lead men in His way,
He has no tongue but our tongues to tell men how He died,
He has no help but our help to bring them to His side.

The Exaltation of our Lord Jesus Christ.

By the Reverend A. W. Argyle, M.A., B.D.(Oxon.), Gerrard's Cross, Bucks.

By the 'Exaltation' of our Lord is meant the glory which He received from the Father consequent upon His Ascension (ἀνάβασις) or Assumption (ἀνάλημψις).

I.

The only primitive *records* of the Ascension are those of Luke which we find at the end of his Gospel and at the beginning of the Acts. The passage in the Gospel is fraught with textual uncertainty. It is improbable that the original recorded that Jesus was 'carried up into heaven' or that the disciples 'worshipped Him' (ἀνεφέρετο εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν and προσκυνήσαντες αὐτόν are not in some of the best MSS., and they are not likely to have been omitted if they had been originally in the text). The original text certainly recorded that Jesus parted from the disciples (διέστη ἀπ' αὐτῶν); and His last words and the manner of His departing were evidently specially significant and reassuring, for ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἰερουσαλὴμ μετὰ χαρᾶς μεγάλης, καὶ ἦσαν διὰ παντὸς ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ εὐλογοῦντες τὸν Θεόν. According to Acts, Jesus was 'taken up' (ἐπήρθη), and a cloud received Him out of the sight of the disciples (Ac 1^{9}; cf. ἀναλημφθείς, *v.*^{11}). Jesus had disappeared before (*e.g.*, Lk 24^{31}), but the Ascension was realized to be the final disappearance. Two men in white raiment reassured the disciples, as they gazed into heaven, with a promise of the Second Advent: 'Jesus . . . shall so come in like manner as ye beheld him going into heaven' (Ac 1^{11}).

The account at the beginning of Acts states that there was an interval of forty days between the Resurrection and the Ascension (Ac 1^{3}); this is not mentioned in the Gospel passage, but is not incompatible with the vague chronology of the closing verses of Luke's Gospel.

The locality of the Ascension is the same in both accounts, for Bethany, mentioned in the Gospel, lay on the eastern slope of Olivet, from which, according to Acts, the disciples returned into Jerusalem (ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς Ἰερουσαλήμ, Ac 1^{12} the same words as in the Gospel).

In the Gospel the words of commission are spoken by our Lord *in Jerusalem* before going forth towards Bethany: in Acts they form the Saviour's last address *on Olivet* immediately prior to the Ascension; but this is a very minor discrepancy.

II.

Earlier, however, than these *records* of the Ascension, we have several *allusions* to the event, some indirect, others more explicit. Probably the earliest passage to imply the Ascension is 1 Th 1^{10}, 'to wait for his Son from heaven.' In looking forward to the Second Advent, these words imply a previous Ascension of Jesus into heaven;

but the following words 'whom he raised from the dead' seem to connect the Ascension very closely with the Resurrection. This is so again in Ro 8^{34}: 'It is Christ Jesus that died, yea rather, that was raised from the dead, who is at the right hand of God, who also maketh intercession for us.' It is certainly possible to read this passage as meaning that the Exaltation of Christ was immediately consequent upon the Resurrection, which would then have to be identified with the Ascension.

Harnack indeed confidently asserted that the Ascension had no separate place in the primitive tradition. But although the evidence admits of this conclusion, it does not necessitate it. The fact that Paul does not explicitly distinguish the Ascension from the Resurrection does not prove that he was unaware of the distinction. The only conclusion which we can confidently draw is that the distinction, which may or may not have existed in the earliest *κήρυγμα*, certainly did exist by the time when Luke-Acts was written. In any case the process of Exaltation in its widest sense may be said to have begun with the Resurrection.

Even later than Acts, however, opinion for a long time fluctuated with regard to the interval which elapsed between the Resurrection and the Ascension. A verse in Hebrews (1^3) appears to represent Christ as ascending directly from the Cross into Heaven (*καθαρισμὸν τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν ποιησάμενος ἐκάθισεν ἐν δεξιᾷ τῆς Μεγαλωσύνης ἐν ὑψηλοῖς*). The words of the Epistle of Barnabas ('We keep the eighth day for rejoicing, on which Jesus both rose from the dead, and, after his manifestation, ascended into heaven'), whether or not they mean that both the Resurrection and the Ascension occurred on the *same* Sunday, are hardly reconcilable with the natural implications of Ac 1^3 (*δι' ἡμερῶν τεσσεράκοντα ὀπτανόμενος*). The fact that the Valentinians make the interval eighteen months, the Ophites eleven or twelve years, and Eusebius three and a half years, shows that the statement of Ac 1^3 was not always accepted as fixing a limit of time. But from the first no doubt was thrown on the *fact* of the Ascension.

III.

Leaving now the question of the fact and time of the Ascension, let us consider first the significance given to the Exaltation in the earliest *κήρυγμα*, and then the significance which ought to be attached to it to-day.

(1) The Exaltation was regarded as the fulfilment of so-called prophetic passages in the Psalms, *e.g.*, 68^{18}, 'Thou hast ascended on high, thou hast led thy captivity captive.' 110^1, 'Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool.' 118^{22}, 'The stone which the builders rejected is become the head of the corner.'

(2) There is a passage in Peter's speech in Ac 2 which is capable of Adoptionist interpretation. The quotation from Ps 118^{22} is followed by the words: 'Let all the house of Israel therefore know assuredly, that God hath made him both Lord and Christ, this Jesus whom ye crucified' (Ac 2^{36}). The words *καὶ Κύριον αὐτὸν καὶ Χριστὸν ἐποίησεν ὁ Θεός* seem to imply that the Exaltation of our Lord consisted in the raising of Him to the status of Divinity.

(3) In contrast with this, in Ph $2^{9\text{-}11}$, we have a view of the Exaltation as a reversal of the *κένωσις* with added glory. Having described the process whereby Christ Jesus, being in the form of, and on an equality with, God, emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men, and humbled Himself, becoming obedient even unto the death of the gallows, thus touching the lowest point of His humiliation, St. Paul then describes the Exaltation as the reverse, or upward, process: 'Wherefore also God highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow . . . and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.' Here the Exaltation is regarded, not as the *conferring* of divinity upon Christ, but as the re-assertion and consummation of a divinity which was already His.

(4) Another important development is the soteriological aspect touched upon in Ac 5^{31}: 'Him did God exalt with his right hand to be a Prince and a Saviour, for to give repentance to Israel, and remission of sins.' Cf. Ro 8^{34}, 'Who also maketh intercession for us.' This is later developed in Hebrews, where the ascended Christ is an Eternal heavenly Priest and Intercessor.

(5) The Exaltation is regarded alike in Acts and in the Fourth Gospel as the necessary preliminary to the sending of the Holy Spirit (*e.g.*, Ac $1^{5.\ 8}$ 2^{33}, Jn $16^{7.\ 13}$ etc.).

(6) There is, finally, the strong eschatological significance attached to the Exaltation in Acts, the early writings of Paul, the Apocalyptic discourses of the New Testament, and such Parables as The Waiting Servants and The Pounds, at least as interpreted by the Evangelists. In Ac 3^{21} Jesus is described as one 'whom the heaven must receive until the times of the restoration of all things.' In 1 Th 1^{10} Paul says that the ascended Jesus who shall come from heaven 'delivereth us from the wrath to come.' Ro 2^{16} looks forward to the day when God shall judge the secrets of man, according to His gospel, by Jesus Christ.

The apostles at first believed that the ascended

Christ would soon return to earth to set up a Messianic Kingdom and to pronounce judgment. But, in Paul's case, as his interest in the speedy Second Advent of Christ declined, the 'futurist eschatology' of his earlier phase falls into the background and yields the foremost place to what has been called 'Christ-mysticism.' 'The hope of a glory yet to come remains,' says Professor C. H. Dodd,[1] 'as a background of thought, but the foreground is more and more occupied by the contemplation of all the riches of Divine grace enjoyed here and now by those who are in Christ Jesus'; and this view finds its consummate expression in the Fourth Gospel.

IV.

We may now consider the present-day significance of the Ascension and Exaltation; and we may discuss the two ideas separately, because, although indissolubly connected, they are logically distinct.

First, then, the Ascension cannot mean for us exactly what it meant to the Early Church. In those days the Universe was regarded as a three-storeyed building, or rather as a two-storeyed building with a basement. Heaven was the top storey, the earth was at the centre, and the abode of the dead was beneath. Thus the Ascension was regarded as the removal of Christ to a spacial heaven located above the sky. Christ was thought of as literally separated from His followers, and the Holy Spirit was sent to guide and sustain them. To-day we no longer regard heaven spacially as being at a distance above the earth, and we regard the Ascension rather as Christ's disappearance from the world of space into the spiritual realm, with the result that we do not conceive of Him as being separated from us by an interval of distance. We know from the existence of our own minds that what is spiritual can at once transcend, and yet be immanent in, the physical world. But the primitive Christian view of Christ as having gone away to a distant place lingered in the Church long after the Copernican revolution, and in some minds it lingers still. Some of the Protestant Reformers were not free from it. Thus Zwingli spoke of the bread and wine of the Eucharist as being '*signa Christi absentis*,' and declared in support of his argument: '*Abiit: ergo non est hic.*' To-day we regard Christ, not as corporeally absent, but as spiritually present. When He finished His incarnate life, He escaped from the limits of physical existence and entered a realm where no space can divide. This was true Exaltation, and we may now pass on to discuss this aspect more specifically.

As the famous passage in Ph 2 suggests, the Exaltation was the reversal of the κένωσις with the conferment of an added glory. By becoming man Christ relinquished certain Divine attributes such as omnipotence and omniscience, took upon Himself the limitations of our human nature, and condescended even to the most ignominious form of death; but in His Exaltation, which certainly in the widest sense may be said to have begun with the Resurrection, He was shown to be very God and recovered the full attributes of Divinity, adorned with a new glory and an added lustre. This Exaltation of Christ assures us of His sure and sovereign control of history, His unassailable victory over sin and death, His power to give us eternal life, and to bring the course of the Universe to a final and just consummation. The correlative of an exalted Christ is a reverent, humble, yet confident Christian, who will worship God in spirit and in truth. The Christ whom we worship is not merely the lowly figure who walked in Palestine nearly two thousand years ago, but One, exalted by the power of God, who reigns in glory and eternal Divinity with Him.

Finally, the soteriological aspect of the Ascended Christ as Mediator and Intercessor should be a prominent feature of modern, as of Apostolic, preaching. Christ is, in the words of Hebrews, 'a great high priest, that is passed into the heavens' (4^{14}) and 'He is able to save to the uttermost them that draw near unto God through him, seeing he ever liveth to make intercession for them' (7^{25}). The Exaltation is the guarantee of eternal forgiveness. He condescended to humanity that we at last might ascend after Him, and through Him into the Presence of God. By His mediation and intercession our reconciliation with God, initiated on the Cross, is made complete.

[1] *Apostolic Preaching and its Developments*, 149.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Christ and Time. Professor O. Cullmann, formerly of Strasbourg and now of Basel, is a well-known scholar and the author of many works. In *Christ and Time* [1] he has published an important study of the Christian view of history. He argues that whereas the Greek view of Time was cyclic, the Christian view, like the Jewish, was linear. But the Christian view involves a threefold division into the pre-Creation age, the present age, and the future age, with the life, death, and resurrection of Christ as the focal point of the whole, whereas the Jewish view links the pre-Creation period with the present age, and places the supreme crisis of history in the future, dividing the present age from the age to be. Bound up with this is the recognition of history as the sphere of revelation, so that in the Old Testament the historical books are reckoned as prophecy and in the New the first four books are regarded, not as history or biography, but as gospel. Our faith is thus founded not on myths which symbolize its teaching, but on historical facts in which it has taken living and concrete form within the world of time.

The four parts into which the work is divided bear the keywords: Οἰκονομία, Ἐφάπαξ, Δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα and Ἡ ζωὴ ὑμῶν κέκρυπται σὺν τῷ Χριστῷ ἐν τῷ θεῷ. In the first the 'New' Testament terms for Time are examined, and its conception of the relation between Time and Eternity analysed. In the second the uniqueness of the focal point of history in Christ and His relations with the past, the future, and the present are unfolded. In the third the universality of His lordship is set forth, and He is presented as the Lord of history, of the Church, and of the world. Here Professor Cullmann breaks a lance with Emil Brunner whom he charges with error in finding Christ to be Lord of the Church alone, while the world is under the rule of God. Cullmann observes that the New Testament knows no dualism between the sphere of God's rule and that of Christ. The final section of the book treats of the place of the individual in the history of redemption, in relation to the past, the present, and the future.

It is curious to note that while references to French and German literature abound in the book, references to British and American works seem to be entirely lacking.

The Transfiguration. In marked contrast with Cullmann's book is the work of the Swedish writer, H. Riesenfeld, entitled *Jesus Transfigured*.[2] Here we find a study of the cultic background of all the motifs which enter into the story of the Transfiguration. The author is not concerned to examine how far the story is historical, but rather to connect all the motifs with the ancient autumn fertility cult festival, of pre-Israelite origin, out of which the Feast of Tabernacles developed. He finds a disintegration and spiritualization of ancient elements in later usage, and a reintegration of those elements in the Transfiguration story. All that is highest and best in the religion of Israel is here traced to what the Old Testament calls Baalism, and Moses and the prophets and all that savours of a revelation in history are completely ignored. Moses and Elijah are found to figure in the Transfiguration story for theological reasons and to have no place in the fundamental pattern of the story, which is cultic. The autumn festival is made the master key for the unlocking of all doors, and the sacred marriage, which became democratized in ordinary marriage, is found to be the source of the Messianic idea as well as of the concept of the Suffering Servant. Talmudic and later literature is drawn on as readily as ancient sources with slight regard for temporal considerations, and passages which in later times were read at the Feast of Tabernacles are drawn on as evidence for the original character of the feast, while the connexion of סֻכָּה with חִפָּה and the recognition that both are species of אֹהֶל, which has יְרִיעוֹת, enables the author to draw freely from passages where any of these words are used to serve his purposes. The reviewer therefore often finds himself not wholly convinced. At the same time he recognizes in Dr. Riesenfeld's book a work of real importance. Its emphasis seems one sided, as the emphasis of the pan-Babylonian school and every other school that has carried a single idea to extremes has been. Yet it is the emphasis on one element of the truth. It is perfectly true that pre-Israelite religion contributed much to the cult and faith of Judaism, and that while some elements of Baalism were successfully opposed, other elements were integrated with Judaism and made the vehicles of its faith. This element of the truth is much more often entirely ignored, and it is well that it should be presented. Moreover the wealth of learning that has gone into this book will make it a mine of information even for those who are unconvinced.

The Hypostatization of Divine Qualities. Another new Swedish writer has appeared in the person of Helmer Ringgren, who has published a very learned work on *Word and Wisdom*,[3] in which he traces through Egyptian, Sumero-Accadian, Canaanite, Jewish, and pre-Islamic Arabian sources the hypostatization of Divine qualities. The author shows a considerable acquaintance

[1] *Christus und die Zeit: die urchristliche Zeit- und Geschichts-auffassung* [1946]. Evangelischer Verlag A. G. Zollikon, Zürich.

[2] *Jésus transfiguré: l'arrière-plan du récit évangélique de la Transfiguration de Notre-Seigneur* [1947]. Munksgaard, Copenhagen.

[3] *Word and Wisdom: Studies in the Hypostatization of Divine Qualities and Functions in the Ancient Near East* [1947]. Håkan Ohlssons Boktryckeri, Lund.

with the original sources over this wide field, and reflects the strongly anti-evolutionistic outlook which is characteristic of the Upsala school of Comparative Religion. Disputing the assumption of the evolutionistic school that monotheism is the final stage of religious development, he endeavours to show how monotheism becomes polytheism by the hypostatization of functions and qualities of God, until the hypostatizations are treated as independent deities. The evidence he assembles is interesting and valuable, and in his final conclusions the author shows commendable balance and restraint. He recognizes that crossing the tendency towards 'Götterspaltung' there is the opposite tendence of 'Göttervereinigung.' The same combination of opposing tendencies is to be found, of course, in other spheres. Centrifugal and centripetal forces are known to the scientist, dissimilation and assimilation to the philologian. It is therefore not unique to find in the sphere of religion the two tendencies that lead to the resolving of a single God into many or of the many into the one. It means, however, that while the dogmatism that assumes a uniform linear development of religion towards monotheism is wrong, it is equally impossible to assume a development away from a primitive monotheism. The question is not to be determined either way on grounds of general principles, but on grounds of evidence, and it is doubtful whether adequate data exist to recover with any security the original religion of man. Indeed there are large assumptions in any reference to the original religion of man. Dr. Ringgren is careful not to overpress his evidence, and his readers will be well advised not to jump to the conclusion that the discrediting of evolutionistic assumptions of itself establishes anti-evolutionistic conclusions. Evolutionary and non-evolutionary factors entered into the story of religion, and the evolutionary factors were sometimes evolution towards monotheism and sometimes evolution from monotheism. Certain it is that not all polytheism rests on hypostatization. Dr. Ringgren is to be commended for the learned and well-documented contribution he has made to the subject, and he himself would be the last to claim that it is more than a contribution.

H. H. Rowley.

Manchester.

Contributions and Comments.

A Note on πάσχα in the Synoptic Gospels.

In the Synoptic Gospels the word *πάσχα* occurs five times in St. Mark [1] and once in St. Luke.[2]

The form of the word is significant. It is a transliteration of an Aramaic word. In the LXX the translators followed both the Aramaic and the Hebrew forms of the word. In 2 Chronicles [3] the form is always *φασέκ* or *φασέχ*, which is manifestly a transliteration of the Hebrew פֶּסַח. Aquila and Symmachus make use of the same transliteration. But in the transliterations found in the early parts of the Old Testament it is the Aramaic word which is transliterated, *i.e.* פַּסְחָא.[4]

Now as early as 500 B.C. we know that the Jews of Elephantine spoke Aramaic. The Aramaic papyri there discovered prove this.[5] Other papyri and inscriptions from other parts of Egypt (Abydos, Memphis and Saqqara) prove that Aramaic and Phœnician were known during the two following centuries.[6] It is remarkable therefore that Cowley should suggest [7] that even in these few documents the Aramaic word פַּסְחָא originally existed as early as 419 B.C.

That this Aramaic influence continued is obvious when we come to the earliest parts of the LXX. Instead of transliterating the Hebrew גֵּר as *γήρ* or translating it by the Greek *πάροικος* which we find in the later books of the LXX, we notice that the translators avail themselves of the Aramaic גִּיּוֹרָא which they transliterate as *γειώρας*.[8] Burkitt has detected further examples of this tendency in the Greek transliteration of Isaiah where the Aramaic פַּחְכָּרָא is transliterated as *πάτραρχον* or *πάτρια*.[9] Nestle goes still further and adds seven illustrations of the indebtedness of the LXX to Aramaic.[10] It looks therefore as though the contention of Zahn is eminently reasonable: 'The Jews of Alexandria who translated the Old Testament in Greek still retained a respectable knowledge of the original; but their native tongue was not the Hebrew of the Old Testament . . . but Aramaic.' [11] Their use of *πάσχα* therefore is natural; they were transliterating from the Aramaic of everyday use.

The Synoptics and Josephus are likewise indebted to the Aramaic. Josephus tells us that he first wrote his work in Aramaic and that he later translated it into Greek. We are not surprised therefore to find he transliterates פַּסְחָא as

[1] Mk 14[1. 12] (2) [14. 16] and parallels. [2] Lk 2[41].

[3] Hatch and Redpath, *A Concordance to the Septuagint, s.v. φασέκ, φασέχ.*

[4] *Ib., s.v. πάσχα.*

[5] A. E. Cowley, *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C., passim.*

[6] G. A. Cooke, *A Text-Book of North-Semitic Inscriptions*, 90 ff. and 200 ff.

[7] Cowley, *op. cit.*, 64.

[8] Thackeray, *Grammar of the O.T. in Greek*, 28.

[9] *Ib.*, p. xx.

[10] Swete, *Introduction to the O.T. in Greek*, 319, *n.* 3.

[11] *Introduction to the New Testament*, i. 46.

φάσκα.[1] In like manner the Synoptics preserve recollections of their indebtedness to Aramaic when they record πάσχα, the slight aspiration of the ' ס ' which is suggested by Josephus being no more than a dialectical variation.

F. Bussby.

Lichfield.

The Cup Metaphor in Mark xiv. 36.

The Rev. C. E. B. Cranfield's note on the above in the February number of The Expository Times is an interesting example of the limitations of an interpretation of a New Testament text based solely on Old Testament parallels. So far as the Old Testament evidence is concerned, his exegesis of Mk 14^{36} and parallels appears to be sound—the Cup is nowhere in the Old Testament a metaphor for suffering and death.

But we cannot assume that the Old Testament provides us with an exhaustive background for the New, even in the case of a metaphor so characteristically Hebrew. The thought-world of our Lord included the Old Testament—and much besides.

It is well known that the New Testament metaphor of ' tasting ' death does not occur in the Old; for it we have to go to rabbinical sources.[2] The same holds good for the metaphor of the Cup: the following parallel occurs in the free Haggadic paraphrase of the old Palestinian Targum, to the importance of which in this connexion I have called attention elsewhere: the passage is at Gn 40^{23} in the so-called Fragment Targum, ' Now Joseph forsook the mercy from above . . . he put his trust in the flesh that passeth away, and in the flesh *that tasteth the cup of death.*' [3]

As Mk 10^{39} clearly indicates, where the same Cup is foretold for the disciples, *de calice sacramenti passionis interrogat* (Hilary).

M. Black.

Leeds.

[1] *B.J.*, XI. i. 3; *Ant.* V. i. 4, IX. xiii. 3.

[2] Cf. H. B. Swete, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, 186.

[3] The Aramaic text will be found in Moses Ginsburger, *Das Fragmententhargum* [Berlin, 1899], 21 (7 lines from foot); cf. J. W. Etheridge, *The Targums on the Pentateuch*, i. 300, l. 8.

Entre Nous.

Albert Schweitzer.

Lucian tells us that there was a law in Greece that no statue of a victor at the games was allowed to be erected larger than the actual life size of the man, and that obedience to this regulation was most rigorously enforced. It would have been well if Mr. George Seaver had remembered that fact when writing his interesting and enthusiastic study of *Albert Schweitzer* (Black; 18s. net).

For, to be met by the opening sentence ' Albert Schweitzer is probably the most gifted genius of our age, as well as its most prophetic thinker ' is to have thrown at one what is more than questionable. While to end a chapter with the full-throated claim, ' the opinion may here with sober consideration be advanced that *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle* is by far the greatest study of the apostle's thought that has ever been produced, or that in all likelihood ever can be,' seems silly, for this reason, if for no other, that that short word ' ever ' contains illimitable wastes of time in it, and possibilities beyond numbering.

Nor is there any need for these wild exaggerations. For, depicted at life size, no more, Schweitzer is a great creature of God—this big, shy, reserved, likeable person, who, as boy and man, in play or work, has always been impatient of half-heartedness, and has carried through whatever he has done with his whole being. ' The great secret of success,' he has affirmed, ' is to go through life as a man who never gets used up.' A fortunate mortal, he was endowed with many talents and, in virtue of them, has lived many different lives, and risen to eminence in various separated spheres. A brilliant student, an admired teacher, a preacher (sometimes he has spoken of that as if he held it to be fundamental, ' preaching is a necessity of my being ' so he has claimed; yet in his youth he got into trouble because of the brevity of his sermons; and, asked to explain, gave the unanswerable answer that he stopped when he had no more to say upon the text—surely an admirable rule), a real musician who, Widor being witness, when himself Widor's pupil, taught that master of Bach to know and understand Bach, an eminent medical man, and the missionary who has caught men's eyes more, perhaps, than any other in his generation, it is all set down for us here—the early triumphs, the call to help his suffering fellow-men—' And he rose up, left all, and followed '—in his case an impressive all, in fact and opening possibility—the life and work in Africa, its toil, its successes, its discouragements—' Once in despair at the utter imbecility and incorrigible disobedience of his patients, he groaned aloud " What a blockhead I was to come out here to doctor savages like these " ' ; the sanity and humour and practical common sense with which he has faced and overcome his endless problems; the humility with which, when preaching Jesus Christ, he has sought to lower himself to the mental level of his hearers, and speak effectively to those with whom he has no common ground from which he can start, and nothing in their minds to which he can appeal—nothing, or all but nothing.

What drove him to his missionary task was his horror of pain, to him far worse than death. 'When I look out upon the world,' said A. B. Davidson, 'it is not its sin that strikes me first, but its suffering and sorrow.' So was it with Schweitzer too. To let our fellow-men, millions of them, go on enduring agonies which we could cure, that to him was the crime of crimes; and he would have the missionary societies employ even Muhammadans (and he does not like Muhammadanism) if only they will relieve human pain.

And then there are the leaves to Europe, those so-called rests which, with a kind of fury of maniacal energy, he has filled to the brim with endless activities, here, there, and everywhere, lecturing, seeing organs, preaching, spending himself so thoroughly that only the sea voyages back to Africa have given him strength enough to continue his work there.

It seems a happy life. And indeed it all began one morning in his youth when he woke up to 'the thought that I must not accept this happiness as a matter of course, but must give something in exchange for it,' the thought that he was destined to work out in his 'Civilization and Ethics.' It looks a full and happy life. What else could it be, one is inclined to ask, given its guiding principle 'Try to live in the spirit of Jesus.'

And yet, strangely enough, he confesses that 'only at quite rare moments have I felt really glad to be alive.' That is an unexpected proof of second-rateness. For the greatest saints do not feel like that, but have received from Christ the joy He promises to whoso will accept it from Him.

This volume has as its sub-title 'The Man and His Mind.' One hundred and sixty pages are devoted to the man, one hundred and fifty to his books and teaching. Once, himself hauling beams and planks about in the hot sun, he called out to a native visitor sitting cool and at his ease, 'Hullo! friend, won't you lend us a hand?' 'I am an intellectual and don't drag wood about,' came the answer. 'You're lucky,' I reply, 'I too wanted to become an intellectual, but I didn't succeed.' Or again, one day requested to give his opinion at the Synod, he did so. Whereupon one of the native preachers suggested that the matter was outside the Doctor's province 'because he is not a theologian as we are.' Yet, in contradistinction to these black friends of his, many hold to it doggedly that Schweitzer is to be numbered with the intellectuals, and is even something of a theologian! His writings have, of course, made a great stir, have had a very definite influence upon his generation. They are of many kinds. 'On the Edge of the Primeval Forest' and others of that genus, books too, not really very deep, but true and fascinating on Comparative Religion, a classic work on Bach, and theological studies such as 'The Quest of the Historical Jesus,' and 'The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle.' All these through time have grown familiar to very many. Those who have not read them will find here summaries by an enthusiast to whom the 'supreme achievement' is 'Civilization and Ethics,' over which he becomes lyrical. To some, now that it has outlived its first startling novelty and has fallen back among the ruck of things, Schweitzer's teaching seems lop-sided and exaggerated. For them, unlike Mr. Seaver, it is not the final reading and pronouncement, long expected, come at last, but a daring and interesting theory to be considered carefully with other theories.

But the man is really bigger than his books. Speaking in the general and not merely of himself, Carlyle lays it down that 'not what I have, and not what I do, but what I am gives me my kingdom, and is, indeed, my kingdom.' Impressive though his books have proved, it is his life of sacrifice and of unselfishness that has given Schweitzer his place in his fellows' regard. Crabbe Robinson once said, quaintly enough, that if one had never lived, Goethe would convince him that a human life would be worth while. Whether or no that be an apt judgment upon Goethe (and Schiller, for one, passed a very scathing verdict on him) it seems true of Albert Schweitzer.

A. J. GOSSIP.

Unsolved New Testament Problems.

The first article in our new series appeared last month—*The Messianic Secret in Mark*, by Principal Vincent Taylor, D.D. In an introductory paragraph Dr. Taylor kindly outlined the purpose and scope of the series. The following studies have been arranged already and others may be added. *The Problem of the Aramaic Element in the Gospels; The Apocalypse: A Review and Revision of Vischer's Theory; The Problem of the Authorship of First Peter; The Cleansing of the Temple in John; The Jewish Background of the Sayings of Jesus; Goodspeed's Theory regarding the Origin of Ephesians; The Place of Eschatology in the Fourth Gospel; The Son of Man; The Markan Apocalyptic Discourse.* The contributors are: the Rev. Matthew Black, B.D., Ph.D., D.Litt.; Professor Emeritus J. Hugh Michael, D.D.; the Very Rev. E. G. Selwyn, D.D., Dean of Winchester; Professor R. H. Lightfoot, D.D.; Professor W. D. Davies, B.D.; the Rev. C. L. Mitton, B.A., M.Th.; the Rev. C. K. Barrett, M.A.; and the Rev. Dr. John Bowman.

Professor K. S. Latourette.

In the January number the publishers of a small book by Professor Latourette, *The Unquenchable Light*, were wrongly given as the Student Christian Movement Press. This should have been Messrs. Eyre & Spottiswoode, Ltd.

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.

POSTAL TUITION

FOR THE LONDON UNIVERSITY

B.D.

& M.Th. DEGREES ; DIPLOMA IN THEOLOGY

London University degree examinations are open to all. University residence is unnecessary. Candidates may read at home ; those over 23 may take the shorter Special Entrance, instead of the Matriculation, Examination.

Many ministers have secured London B.A., B.D. & M.Th. degrees through entrusting their entire preparation to Wolsey Hall. In the hands of experienced and sympathetic graduate tutors studying for a Degree at home becomes a pleasure. Fees are moderate, and may be spread over the period of the Course. Moreover, should you be compelled to suspend or discontinue the Course, for *any* reason, *no* further instalments are payable beyond those due at the time. In the event of failure, tuition is continued *free of charge.*

HEBREW IS NOT NOW REQUIRED

for a Pass at London B.D.

Under the latest Regulations it is possible to obtain a *Pass* at London B.D. without offering Hebrew. To gain Honours, Candidates must still offer this subject

PROSPECTUS

and particulars of the new Regulations may be obtained post free and without incurring the least obligation from C. D. Parker, M.A., LL.D., Director of Studies, Dept. GE 44,

Wolsey Hall, Oxford

PROPRIETORS: DIPLOMA CORRESPONDENCE COLLEGE, LTD.

Distinctive Printing

WILL ALWAYS APPEAL!

We shall be pleased to submit suggestions for your **PRINTING** and **PUBLICITY REQUIREMENTS**

Write for particulars now to

MORRISON & GIBB Ltd.

PRINTERS • • BOOKBINDERS

TANFIELD, EDINBURGH

W. & A. K. JOHNSTON Ltd.

LITHOGRAPHERS • MAP PRINTERS

EDINA WORKS, EASTER ROAD, EDINBURGH

THE SPEAKER'S BIBLE

Edited by

Rev. E. HASTINGS, M.A.

The following volumes are again available :

ST. MATTHEW, Vol. III

ST. JOHN, Vol. I

I CORINTHIANS, Vol. I

I CORINTHIANS, Vol. II

and PHILEMON

Price 12s. 6d. net each

These may be had from any Bookseller or direct from

"THE SPEAKER'S BIBLE" OFFICE

ABERDEEN

S.P.C.K.

WITH CHRIST IN GOD

A Study of Human Destiny

By SHIRLEY C. HUGHSON, O.H.C. **15s.**

For the devout Christian there is one supreme subject—the love of God. This book needs no other commendation than that its author addresses himself humbly, and with deep sincerity, to his subject. He writes for the ordinary, intelligent layman, although he is not only a recognised authority on the spiritual life, but a religious of the Order of the Holy Cross in New York.

THE PARISH PRIEST AT WORK

An Introduction to Systematic Pastoralia

By C. R. FORDER **12s. 6d.**

This book has been prepared with the object of presenting within one cover the information required by the parson for every side of his pastoral work. While the author is frankly realistic, the reader is never allowed to forget that the parson's calling is spiritual.

MARRIAGE IN CHURCH AND STATE

By T. A. LACEY **10s. 6d.**

The late Canon Lacey's great book on Marriage in Church and State has been out of print for some years, and has in some respects become out of date. It has accordingly been thoroughly revised and in certain parts rewritten by R. C. Mortimer, D.D., Regius Professor of Moral and Pastoral Theology and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. The result is an essential text-book on marriage which every priest and many laymen must possess.

OUR CULTURE: ITS CHRISTIAN ROOTS AND PRESENT CRISIS

The Edward Alleyn Lectures of 1944

Edited by V. A. DEMANT, D.Litt. **5s.**

The lecturers are : V. A. Demant, H. A. Hodges, Christopher Dawson, Dorothy L. Sayers and Maurice B. Reckitt. No essay by any of these authors should be neglected at the present time, and here they combine in a carefully planned and penetrating inquiry into the critical situation of our modern civilisation.

THE GENIUS OF THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND

Two Lectures given at the Archbishop of York's Clergy School, July, 1945 **2s. 6d.**

1. **Theology in the Church of England**

By the Rt. Rev. A. E. J. RAWLINSON

2. **The Church of England in History and To-day**

By Canon CHARLES SMYTH

THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND THE NON-EPISCOPAL CHURCHES IN THE SIXTEENTH AND SEVENTEENTH CENTURIES

An Essay towards an Historical Interpretation of the Anglican Tradition from Whitgift to Wake

By Prof. NORMAN SYKES **1s. 6d.**

THE THEOLOGY OF CHRISTIAN INITIATION

Being the Report of a Theological Commission appointed by the Archbishops of Canterbury and York to advise on the relations between Baptism, Confirmation and Holy Communion.

1s.

Northumberland Avenue, W.C.2

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES. *Registered for Transmission by Canadian Magazine Post. Entered as Second-Class Matter 15th March 1929, at the Post Office, Boston, Mass., U.S.A.*

PUBLISHERS—T. & T. CLARK, 38 GEORGE STREET, EDINBURGH, 2. *Annual Subscription, including postage, 16s. 6d. net.*

AGENTS—WILLIAM DAWSON & SONS LTD., LONDON, E.C.4. CHARLES SCRIBNER'S SONS, NEW YORK, U.S.A.

ADVERTISING DEPARTMENT—KING'S GATE, ABERDEEN. *Rates—£7, 7s. per page; smaller spaces pro rata. 'Copy' to be received not later than the 6th of the previous month.*